Earl Browder

FIGHTING for PEACE

Concerted Action • Isolation • "Neutrality"
Munich and After • England, France and
U.S.S.R. • Axis Threat to Latin America
Cooperation Between U.S.A. and U.S.S.R.

PRICE [illegible] CENTS

+8190

FIGHTING FOR PEACE

By the Same Author

THE PEOPLE'S FRONT

COMMUNISM IN THE UNITED STATES

WHAT IS COMMUNISM?

FIGHTING *for* PEACE

BY

Earl Browder

GENERAL SECRETARY
COMMUNIST PARTY OF
THE UNITED STATES

INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS

NEW YORK

Copyright, 1939, by

INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS CO., INC.

[Rare]
E
744
B76
1939

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

72

CONTENTS

PAGE

FOREWORD 7

PART ONE

Concerted Action or Isolation: Which Is the Road to Peace?

CHAPTER

I. COLLECTIVE SECURITY 17

II. CONCERTED ACTION OR ISOLATION? 25

III. THE ISOLATIONIST UNITED FRONT 32

IV. THE "HAVES" AND "HAVE-NOTS" 39

V. THE TRADE UNIONS AND PEACE 55

VI. THE NAVAL BILL AND A PEACE PROGRAM 62

VII. A LONG-TERM POLICY 69

VIII. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS 76

IX. TWO LETTERS 80

X. "SHOULD THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT JOIN IN CONCERTED ACTION AGAINST THE FASCIST STATES?" 82

XI. LESSONS OF THE MOSCOW TRIALS 110

PART TWO

The September Days

I. THE WORLD ISSUE—DEFEND DEMOCRACY AND PEACE 139

II. UNITY FOR PEACE 154

CHAPTER PAGE

III. STOP THE SELL-OUT! 158

IV. TWO CABLES FROM PARIS 163

V. THE UNITED STATES AND THE NEW INTERNATIONAL SITUATION 167

VI. THE ELECTIONS AND THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION 172

PART THREE

The Fruits of Munich

I. THE MUNICH BETRAYAL 179

II. AMERICA MUST ANSWER THE NAZI POGROMS 190

III. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS 196

IV. SOCIAL AND NATIONAL SECURITY 201

V. IS AMERICA MENACED BY FOREIGN PROPAGANDA? 217

VI. LENIN AND AMERICA 222

VII. THE ECONOMICS OF COMMUNISM: THE SOVIET ECONOMY IN ITS WORLD RELATION 234

INDEX 251

Foreword

In this book are gathered articles, speeches, and reports, which were published in the period of February 2, 1938, and February 27, 1939, all dealing with the question of American foreign policy, or with other and related questions from the angle of foreign policy. A few items were written many weeks before publication, for example, the first in the book was written in December, 1937, for the *New Republic*, but was published only on February 2, 1938.

The date of each article or speech is important. It is important to ask of those who would pass judgment on questions of foreign policy, what was their attitude on each question at the moment of decision. It is relatively an easy matter to assess a critical decision six months or a year after it has been made, particularly in these days when history moves with seven-league-boots. Even the architect of the Munich Pact, Neville Chamberlain himself, is forced in March, 1939, to admit the catastrophic consequences of the decisions of the end of September, 1938. The real test of fundamental understanding of history in the process of making, is to inquire what was said of the Munich Pact and the policy which it expressed, in September and October of last year.

I would ask the readers of this book to test the soundness of the policies which it advocates from this viewpoint: were the proposals made in time to have avoided the catastrophes which occurred, had they been studied, adopted and acted upon when they were made? Read the brief article published in the *New Masses* for September 27 entitled "Stop the Sell-Out," written a week earlier, in the days between Chamberlain's visits to Berchstegaden and Godesburg. Then read the two cables from

Paris, published, in the *Daily Worker* October 5 and 8; and the article written in Paris October 11, appraising the results of Munich, especially as they affect America. The fact that events have confirmed these articles up to the hilt, is the best proof that the Communists, alone among all organized political groups or parties, understood events while they were taking place and could offer sound counsel. Those articles and cables reflected the course pursued by the Communists, unitedly, all over the world; every other political party or grouping spoke for surrender, or was divided and thereby canceled itself as an influence, or was silent.

Now, considerably less than a year later, all the illusions around the Munich Pact which had paralyzed the parliamentary democracies have been dispelled as completely as last year's fogs. Britain, which had been sold on Munich as "peace for our time," has turned so completely and energetically toward the establishment of a "peace front" to halt further aggression that even Chamberlain has been forced to at least pretend that he accepts the new direction of policy. But Chamberlain's tricky and dilatory maneuvers during the last weeks reveal the sharp danger that the old fox still dreams of repeating Munich, and on a grander scale. Let us never forget that last September he even mobilized the British fleet, but all the time Hitler knew that Chamberlain would come to Munich without conditions. British attempts to set the stage for a new Munich have crashed on the rocks of Soviet vigilance, which stands as the protecting fortress for peace-loving peoples of the whole world.

It is of great historic significance to place on record the words of some outstanding European conservative spokesmen on this question. Thus "Pertinax," prominent "right-wing" publicist of France, remarks in an article for American newspapers early in June:

Last September, Chamberlain knew how to move more quickly when Hitler had to be placated. He still fails to understand . . . that the fate of the continent depends upon what they (the Soviet Union) will do or not do. . . . There is irony in the fact that Chamberlain, having started with outspoken antagonism to anything like co-operation with Russia, should now be compelled to bring it into existence undiluted and unguarded. Such is the ransom for Munich and for what followed Munich.

The forces which are driving Mr. Chamberlain, unwilling as he still is, upon the course of organization of the peace front, are described by Mr. Winston Churchill, prominent Conservative and traditional enemy of the Soviet Union, in the following words:

It is astonishing how swiftly and decisively opinion in Great Britain and France has consolidated itself upon a triple alliance with Soviet Russia. The well-known objections have simply ceased to count with enormous numbers of people with whom abhorrence of Communism is still a first principle. But it should not be supposed that this change arises out of any desperate strait or panic fear. It is due to the realization of the very real harmony of interests which unites the foreign policy of the three countries. . . . *Their common interest is peace.* (My emphasis.—E.B.)

If this is true—and it is, most profoundly—how much more should it be true also of the United States, where the special interests and commitments that distort French and British policy are either absent or much weaker! These words are a dramatic confirmation of the policy advocated from beginning to end of this book for the United States.

In the current diplomatic negotiations (middle of June), as this book is going to press, the Soviet Union is fighting not at all for any special interest of its own, but equally in the interests of the British and French peoples, and not least for the interests of America. For this view also we have the unequivocal declaration of Mr. Churchill, who wrote:

Personally, not having changed my views about Communism or past history in any respect, I have from the beginning preferred the Russian proposals to either the British or French alternatives. They are simple, they are logical and they conform to the main groupings of common interest.

It is no temporary or accidental conjuncture of circumstances which gave birth to the current negotiations for a peace front. The alignment arises inevitably from the interests of great populations, product of generations of historical development, which cannot be changed to fit the ideological fashions of the day even to please the "omnipotent" rulers of the world of finance capital, of monopoly. For this view also we have the supporting testimony of Mr. Churchill, who declared:

There is a real and honorable basis of equal and rightful interest existing in external affairs between the Soviets and the parliamentary democracies. It is this that has invested the triple peace design with vitality. Matters have now gone so far that it is inconceivable that any of the three governments could take the responsibility of depriving the hundreds of millions of working people involved of this joint security for their life and progress. Agreement is driven forward by irresistible forces overriding and shearing away serious obstacles and valid prejudices as if they were but straws.

Of course, there are Americans to whom these views are extremely obnoxious, whether they are expressed by the Conservative, Winston Churchill, the British Labor Party, Leon Blum, or the Communists. Among those irreconcilable opponents of collaboration for peace with the Soviet Union are Herbert Hoover, Hamilton Fish, Hearst, Father Coughlin, General Moseley, Martin Dies, and Norman Thomas. Whatever differences may exist among these gentlemen and their followers, they are over-ridden and reduced to secondary position by their common fanatical, unreasoning, and irreconcilable hatred for the Soviet Union which brings them all into an

effective alliance on the most burning issues of the day. This alliance is further cemented by a second common hatred, also very intense, against Roosevelt and the New Deal.

It is a sad thing to see the Socialist Party brought into such an alignment of reactionary forces on both foreign and domestic issues, through the ineptitude and muddle-headedness typified by Norman Thomas, and through its illicit dalliance with Trotskyism. That is why that once influential party today resembles nothing so much as Lewis Carroll's famous grinning Cheshire Cat, of Alice's Wonderland, whose body gradually faded away until nothing was left of it but the grin which lingered on, suspended in mid-air, after the Cat had completely disappeared.

The Chamberlain policy of appeasement of the Berlin-Rome-Tokyo axis, bankrupt and routed in Britain itself, still finds strong forces to defend it in the United States. It dominates the Republican and Socialist Parties, as well as the Garner-Dies wing of the Democratic Party, and controls 80 per cent of the press, including such nominal "New Deal" organs as the New York *Post*. But the current of popular opinion and sentiment is running rapidly against it, and its final collapse in the United States is as inevitable and will be as complete as in Britain.

This will be the dominant issue in the Presidential contest in 1940, when the United States must chart its course for another four years.

The present book, *Fighting For Peace*, is intended primarily as a reference book and handbook on this dominant issue, the foreign policy of the United States. It contains, in varied forms, the basic ideological and informational armament needed for the struggle to complete the winning of the American people for an active policy of peace and international order. Its starting point and fundament is the national inter-

ests of the American people. But these national interests are found, not in contradiction to, but in harmony with, the national interests of every people of the earth, not excepting those of Germany, Italy, and Japan, whose hopes of deliverance from misery and bondage depend in large degree upon world organization for peace to halt the aggressions of their rulers. Above all, we find the national interests of the American people in full harmony with those of the peoples of the Soviet Union, and with the policies of the Soviet Government.

On March 18, the Soviet peace policy was given its most adequate and authoritative statement by Joseph Stalin, in his report to the 18th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. This book would be entirely inadequate for its purpose if it omitted that historic declaration, which came after this book was planned and given to the printers. It is therefore quoted here, as the most important substantiation of our main argument, the necessity and practicability of Soviet-American collaboration in world affairs as the main hope and instrument for world peace and international order. Stalin said:

> The foreign policy of the Soviet Union is clear and explicit:
>
> 1. We stand for peace and the strengthening of business relations with all countries. That is our position; and we shall adhere to this position as long as these countries maintain like relations with the Soviet Union, and as long as they make no attempt to trespass on the interests of our country.
>
> 2. We stand for peaceful, close, and friendly relations with all neighboring countries which have common frontiers with the U.S.S.R. That is our position; and we shall adhere to this position as long as these countries maintain like relations with the Soviet Union, and as long as they make no attempt to trespass, directly or indirectly, on the integrity and inviolability of the frontiers of the Soviet state.
>
> 3. We stand for the support of nations which are the victims of aggression and are fighting for the independence of their country.
>
> 4. We are not afraid of the threats of aggressors, and are ready

to deal two blows for every blow delivered by instigators of war who attempt to violate the Soviet borders.

Such is the foreign policy of the Soviet Union.

Every word in Stalin's declaration harmonizes fully with the national interests of the United States. It could be taken entire as a full and correct statement of policy for the United States itself, as a definition of the policy of the "Good Neighbor."

This book, like its predecessors, represents the results, not of an isolated literary effort, but of a broad collaboration in the labor and peace movements of the United States, with my associates in the leadership of the Communist Party of the U.S.A., and with the leaders of fraternal Communist Parties, especially of Latin-America and Canada, France, Britain, Spain, China, the Philippines, and, in the first place, the Soviet Union. Without such a broad and fruitful background and basis of collective effort, such a book as this would be impossible. Having been produced, in its various parts, under the impact of day-to-day events, its lack of a well-planned literary structure must be compensated by those qualities which are produced by the heat of the political battle, in which this book was conceived, and for which it is an instrument. The author must therefore make the broadest acknowledgements, while assuming full personal responsibility for any and all mistakes, and for the particular contents of the book.

To Irene Browder is due special acknowledgment of that constant stimulus and criticism, the insistence upon ever-rising standards of work, which every writer needs above all from his closest associates, and which she has contributed to the production of this book.

Earl Browder

New York, June 19, 1939.

PART ONE

CONCERTED ACTION OR ISOLATION: WHICH IS THE ROAD TO PEACE?

I

Collective Security

Mr. Bruce Bliven has confirmed, in his article of December 1, what I had suspected, that the *New Republic's* advocacy of isolation as the proper approach to foreign affairs by the United States has behind it, at least as one factor, a disturbed conscience in relation to 1917. But I am afraid that he has not studied well what the Communists have to say, either about the last World War or about the one now threatening. Clearly, he does not "understand our language." Allow me, therefore, to make an attempt to put the Communist position as nearly as possible in the language of Mr. Bliven himself, in an effort to break down this linguistic barrier.

Can world peace be maintained? That is the first question toward which we must establish an attitude. If we mean world peace in any absolute sense, then of course the question is meaningless, for right now there are two major wars going on which already have resulted in millions of casualties. The question then must be, can we prevent the two present wars from extending to engulf the whole world?

The answer to this question must begin with that basic fact that the overwhelming mass of the population of all countries, and the governments of most of them, are afraid of war and desire peace. As President Roosevelt expressed it:

> The peace, the freedom and the security of 90 per cent of the population of the world is being jeopardized by the remaining 10 per cent who are threatening a breakdown of all international order and law.

We can dot the "i" by saying that from which Roosevelt is restrained by diplomatic considerations: Peace is being destroyed by Hitler, Mussolini and the Mikado.

Our question is now clearer. Can the fifty to sixty effective governments of the world, with the ardent desire for peace of at least 90 per cent of the world's population behind them, find among themselves sufficient forces for peace to restrain the three war-making powers who may control the remaining 10 per cent of the population but certainly do not command its affection?

Clearly, in this relation of forces, there does exist the possibility of preventing the spread of war, and of extinguishing the wars going on, *provided* the peace-loving 90 per cent can arrive at a concerted program of action, at least to a degree in some relation to that of the concerted action of the Triple Alliance of the "anti-Communist" bloc of fascist states.

What degree of concerted action is necessary? Considering the economic resources of the war-makers, it would clearly be sufficient to bring them quickly to a halt if the United States, France, Britain and the Soviet Union should jointly declare an embargo upon all economic transactions with the aggressors, to be ended when three conditions were met: (1) the withdrawal of all their armed forces into their own territories; (2) the stoppage of all supplies being sent to support civil war in another country; (3) the enforcing of a substantial measure of disarmament.

Considering the military resources of the war-makers, their aggressions would be more quickly stopped, if the peace bloc of powers should, while the aggressions continued, open their markets to the victims of aggression for all their needs, and facilitate their purchases with credits.

Considering the political resources of the war-makers, they would be quickly isolated if the small nations now falling under their sway once knew that the democratic powers, abandoning their "scuttle and run" policy, were making a firm stand for peace; they would be undermined at home, and their own oppressed population encouraged to reassert themselves, if

the peace bloc made a joint declaration of willingness to give full aid and co-operation to any democratic and peaceful government that might succeed the fascist dictatorships.

What are the possibilities that such a policy could be adopted by the four great powers I have named? For the United States, such a policy is clearly indicated as the only possible means of implementing Roosevelt's speech in Chicago on October 5. Clearly, then, in our country the task is to organize effective support behind the President's policy of the 27,000,000 who voted for him in 1936. If that can be done, the United States will uphold its end. It certainly can be done—unless the great masses are also afflicted with the Hamlet-like paralysis that has gripped the minds of the *New Republic's* editors under the hypnosis of fascism, which I cannot believe. As for France, the joy with which Roosevelt's speech was received by the people in that country is sufficient indication that any government which refused a direct proposal from the United States for this policy would be swept out of office in a week and be replaced by a government which would gladly give its adherence. As for the Soviet Union, it has been urging precisely such a policy for years, and would gladly assume its full share of the responsibility.

There remains Britain. I fully share the doubts of Mr. Bliven about the good faith of the Chamberlain government in the defense of peace. I am also full of doubts about the Labor Party leadership which has found it so easy to go along with Mr. Chamberlain in his, to say the least, equivocal course. But I have great faith in the British working class, which has, more than once, over the heads of its own leaders, called a sharp halt to reactionary adventures of the British government. I am sure that a clear call from the United States, France and the Soviet Union will bring the great British people into line for this policy, under a new government if necessary.

This, in brief and simple outline, is the Communist con-

ception of a correct and effective peace policy for the United States.

If such a program is adopted, whose interests would be served thereby? Surely it would be in the interests of every nation that wants peace; of the small nations that tremble today under the imminent threat of destruction; of the workers of every land; and of every honest democrat.

But Mr. Bliven says no, this is a peculiar "Russian" program, "not framed in American terms or the American interest." We will not quarrel with Mr. Bliven as to how the policy could be best "framed in American terms"; we are willing to leave that to the President, if Mr. Bliven can agree upon such an eminent authority. But we do have a sharp quarrel with him when he says that world peace is a special "Russian" interest, which may be contrary to the interests of America. *Peace* is a *common interest* of the Soviet Union and the United States, and, as the two most powerful and peace-loving nations, *especially* of them.

Mr. Bliven bases his peculiar argument, apparently, upon the opinion that America can *purchase* peace, can *buy off* the aggressor nations with concessions and by granting them a free hand elsewhere. He expresses a deep conviction that any resistance, even purely economic, would lead the United States directly into war. But if the United States *does not dare*, from such fear, to take even economic measures, what reason have we to believe this will insure us from the war danger? It was exactly the conviction that the Nanking government *would not dare* to resist that led Tokyo into the present adventure in China. A continuance of isolation policies by the United States will surely convince the arrogant militarists of Tokyo that now is the time for them to take over the Philippines, Hawaii, Guam and Alaska, as guarantees against the future, when the United States *might dare*. From that it would not be a large step to recall how much more successful are Japanese

than Americans in cultivating the beautiful and rich lands of California.

Upon what basis does Mr. Bliven assume that this danger is remote but the danger of a Japanese attack against the Soviet Union is immediate? Is he relying upon the affinity between two capitalist nations, as against the land of socialism? But Japan knows quite well that the land of socialism is fully armed and ready, a tough nut upon which she might break her teeth. She went into China, *expanding along the line of least resistance.* A continuance of the same line leads her not to Vladivostok, Khabarovsk and Chita, but rather to Manila, Honolulu and Nome.

At the present moment in world affairs, America needs the co-operation of the Soviet Union for her own protection from warlike aggression far more pressingly than the Soviet Union needs America for the same purpose. For the Soviet Union is fully prepared to defend itself, is fully united, and has just cleaned house of the last remnants of those who would co-operate with the enemy. But America, rich and full of potential booty, is still considered by the world to be in a pacifist funk, is torn by a constitutional crisis and sharp class struggles, and contains powerful forces that would welcome Japanese aggression for their own fascist ends.

Mr. Bliven says the program of concerted action for peace proposes "to engage in a bluffing game with the fascist powers." He particularly ascribes to the Communists the idea that "the fascists will be outbluffed and will give way." Nothing could be farther from the truth.

It is my conviction that the fascist dictatorships can be halted only by superior force. But with concerted economic action by the great powers to embargo the aggressors and supply their victims, the superior military force that will halt fascism and bring about its downfall is already in action *in Spain and China.* These two heroic peoples are fighting bravely

and steadfastly, and making a good showing *despite* their abandonment by Britain, France and the United States. If we help them, they will do the military job for us, though I hope many thousands more of our best American boys will go to Spain to help the Lincoln Battalion uphold the honor of our people. If we continue to desert them to their fate, as Mr. Bliven advocates, we will have no one to blame but ourselves when we have to take up the full military burden under more unfavorable conditions.

Finally, what is the value of Mr. Bliven's argument that any participation by the United States in a concerted effort for peace would create the danger of extreme reaction, even fascism, coming to power in America precisely as a result of such effort? In my opinion, the truth is exactly the opposite. Only the courageous implementing of the policy laid down by President Roosevelt in Chicago can save our country, and all the capitalist world, from unparalleled reaction and catastrophe.

The greatest threat against domestic progress today, the greatest strength of reaction, lie precisely in the fact, correctly pointed out by Mr. Bliven, that the 27,000,000 who voted for President Roosevelt are not fully united in support of his peace policy. This is true, even though Mr. Bliven underestimates grossly the breadth of this support. All the more reason why all progressives, democrats and lovers of peace, all anti-fascists, should do everything possible to build and strengthen that support, and not to tear it down with doubts, fears and hesitations which cover a complete absence of policy, a happy-go-lucky drifting with no guidance but faith in America's lucky star.

If President Roosevelt's policy goes by default, through lack of popular support, if the progressive camp continues to be divided by the paralysis of fear, then I foresee the grave

danger that the worst reactionary forces in American public life, playing upon the very real dangers that face the American people, will exploit those fears and the absence of a united progressive policy, with demagogic slogans of "preparedness, more preparedness" and "no entangling alliances" and "America for herself alone" and so on, to stampede the people along the path of reaction, militarism and war.

When our country was in its infancy as an independent nation, when it was relatively weak and surrounded by a hostile world, when it was looked upon by older nations as the source of "revolutionary infection," as the capitalist world today looks upon the Soviet Union—in those days we were not afraid to have a positive policy for peace. We had great leaders then, men with faith that the masses of the people would support them.

When in 1793, France, a new republic such as Spain today, was attacked and blockaded, Thomas Jefferson, Secretary of State under Washington, wrote to James Madison:

> The idea seems to gain credit that the naval powers combining against France will prohibit supplies, even of provisions, to that country.... I should hope that Congress ... would instantly exclude from our ports all the manufactures, produce, vessels, and subjects of the nations committing this aggression, during the continuance of the aggression, and till full satisfaction is made for it.

About the same time Jefferson wrote to Morris, Minister to France, the following:

> We received information that a National Assembly had met, with full power to transact the affairs of the nation, and soon afterwards the Minister of France here presented an application for three million livres, to be laid out in provisions to be sent to France.... We had no hesitation to comply with the application ... and we shall ... omit no opportunity of convincing that nation how cordially we wish to serve them ... placing our commerce with that nation and its dependencies on the freest and most encouraging footing possible.

What America needs today, what the world needs, is a foreign policy based upon these lines of Thomas Jefferson. Such a policy has been proposed by President Roosevelt. The whole country must be rallied to support it, and to demand its energetic application in life.

New Republic, February 2, 1938.

II

Concerted Action or Isolation?

Coming out of Spain on February 9, I picked up the *New Republic* of February 2 at Brentano's in Paris. There I found published my article in reply to Mr. Bruce Bliven, written on his invitation in the latter part of December. I was mildly surprised to find that my polemic with Mr. Bliven had been transformed into a debate with Dr. Charles A. Beard. On second thought, however, it seemed only natural that Mr. Bliven should call for help in the controversy, considering that the very essence of his position consists of raising doubt and uncertainty to the level of a principle.

But my surprise at discovering myself thus unceremoniously thrust into an unannounced debate with Dr. Beard was as nothing compared with the astonishment caused by reading what Dr. Beard had to say. I had thought myself inured to all possible surprises, but Dr. Beard carried my education in disillusionment to a higher stage.

This is not because Dr. Beard ascribes to me a bloodthirsty ambition to help President Roosevelt throw America and the world into a general war of mutual extermination. We have long grown used to such a charge; it is old stuff; it is the common stock-in-trade of all isolationists, which they share with the open apologists of fascism. It is a complete begging of the question, of course. All our isolationists, while ostensibly taking up a rational discussion as to which path gives more prospects of maintaining world peace and stopping the current wars, invariably avoid such a discussion in reality as though it were something indecent; they proceed in their arguments upon the *assumption* that everyone who disagrees with them

wants war. They do not even seem to be embarrassed when this dishonest little trick is exposed. So far have the isolationists departed from rational discussion that it is difficult for them to speak or write except in terms of hysterical denunciation of their opponents and a wild appeal to irrational prejudices. Dr. Beard, unfortunately, shows himself no exception in this respect, although we might have expected something better from him.

Dr. Beard, however—and this is the astonishing part—proceeds from the usual isolationist attitude to grounds far beyond any taken by Mr. Bliven, or by any other responsible writer in the liberal or radical press. He proceeds upon such *assumptions*, he poses his questions in such a form, as to admit the validity of all the basic arguments of the fascists.

Tacitly, but nonetheless effectively, Dr. Beard's position is one of *ideological disarmament* in face of the offensive of fascism. He reveals himself as contemptuous of democracy, skeptical of the desirability of peace, and opposed to any struggle against fascism. He does not defend isolation as the path to peace; he merely declares there is no such path.

Nothing that has ever been written in favor of concerted action as the path to peace is quite so conclusively in its favor, as are Dr. Beard's arguments supposedly against it.

Let us examine a few samples. Dr. Beard says:

> It is highly probable that Great Britain could tear Hitler away from the Rome-Berlin axis by handing back to Germany the vast African colonies. . . . Does Great Britain want peace on such terms? Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Browder may know. I may be permitted to have doubts.

Here as in a drop of water is reflected the "cosmos" of isolationism. It *assumes* that there is no way to peace except surrender to the fascist demands. If Mr. Roosevelt or myself have any hopes of peace, we are called upon to substantiate

these hopes by "inside information" that Hitler is going to be given what he wants, or else our hopes are discredited. It is inferred that it is not only unreasonable, but also unjust, to hold any other view. This may be anything else, it may even be the basis for a partnership with Hitler, but it is not in any sense or degree the basis for any struggle against fascism and war.

To follow Beard's thought another step:

> I find in history no justification whatever for assuming as truth that Italy, Germany, and Japan would surrender unconditionally to a grand quarantine if the quarantine could be arranged. On the contrary, I suspect that they would strike back. . . .

Here is a clear acceptance of the fascist bid for world rulership. The quarantine is rejected because the fascists might resist it. Since the fascist powers are in a "war frenzy," a spirit of "world power or downfall," therefore the United States must simply keep out of their way at all costs, allow them to seize the rest of the world piecemeal, and trust in God as to what will happen when they get around to us and can handle us alone. How we can keep out of the way in a world where elbow room is at a premium, and where the United States holds half of the world's wealth that the fascists covet, does not concern Dr. Beard. Since the fascist powers do not invade our territory first, that is sufficient basis for an isolationist policy.

Having laid such a sure foundation, Dr. Beard then draws a deep breath and plunges into the deep water of surrender to fascism. He says:

> Could a quarantine maintain indefinitely the *status quo* of populations, resources, and empire throughout the world? If this were desirable, it scarcely seems possible. . . . There are likely to be profound changes in the distribution of population, resources, and imperial possessions in the future as in the past.

In these words Dr. Beard proclaims the futility of any effort to prevent a general war. He leaves open for argument whether war may not even be "desirable." He only wants to keep the United States out of it—at least until we are fighting for a bigger share in the distribution of the world as the fascists are. He rejects as utopian all idea of international readjustments except through war. He thereby abandons in advance all hopes of restraining the war-making powers.

Coming to the question of democracy, Dr. Beard here also abandons the field to fascism. He wipes out all effective distinction between the democratic and fascist powers (as for the Soviet Union, it is mentioned only in passing). He ridicules any reliance upon the democratic powers. He proceeds to sneer at the labor movement of France, England and America, as inevitably only an appendage to the imperialist circles. He says that all efforts to save democracy can only lead to war—"and the probabilities are that we should then have universal fascism rather than universal democracy." His conclusion is that the more determined is the effort to save democracy, the more certain is it that the very effort will bring the victory of fascism. Democracy is doomed, it has no vitality, and it has no value worth trying to salvage.

In short, for Dr. Beard all roads lead to the inevitable victory of fascism throughout Europe and Asia, and by inference also in the United States in the last analysis. He only hopes that, perhaps, if we keep very quiet and don't talk too loud, the fascists may overlook us for a few years.

From all of which, there is only one practical conclusion, one line of advice for action: Don't do anything, don't say anything, don't try to stop the threatening war, don't try to maintain democracy—everything you do will only bring the catastrophe all the quicker. Fascism and war are inevitable under any circumstances, but if we sit very quiet, do nothing, say nothing, we might be overlooked for a little while. Let us

be thankful for even such a short breathing space before we go to our inevitable doom.

Such are the pitiful depths to which the logic of isolationism has led Dr. Beard. It is indeed a tragedy to see a man, whose life contained so many fearless words and deeds against reaction, come forward in the twilight of that life and in the midst of the world's greatest crisis, with advice of such complete and cowardly surrender.

Dr. Beard proceeds to cover up his surrender with "theoretical" considerations. He rebukes the advocates of concerted action for peace for their supposed "assumption that politics—democratic theory—can be separated from economics." Now if anyone makes such an assumption, it is of course a fatal error, and Dr. Beard has scored a heavy blow. But who assumed this, when, where, how? Dr. Beard is silent on these questions. He merely *assumes* that we are guilty of such an assumption, and lets it go at that.

But this diversion of Dr. Beard, to call upon economics to help him dispose of politics he does not like, is not a naïve gesture. He is hinting, what he dared not say openly, that the defense of democracy is useless or impossible until there has been established full democratic control of the national economy in each country. He has used the statement of an abstract truth to cover up a concrete falsehood of the worst sort. In the name of a perfect democracy, he rejects the struggle for a democracy because it cannot be perfect and entire from the beginning of the struggle.

Dr. Beard is thus operating with a logic that deals only in absolutes. It has no room for a democracy that is in process of becoming, for the struggle to realize democracy. It is a formal, static, mechanical logic, which leads only to doubt, skepticism, passivity and surrender. It is connected with economics itself only formally. It in no way expresses the *economic urgency of*

the masses, which throws them necessarily into *struggle for democracy and peace.*

It is the economic needs of the masses which is the living connection between politics and economics. It is this to which Dr. Beard is completely blind. This blindness is not something new for Dr. Beard. In his historical studies, with all their merits, he has always displayed a lack of understanding of the mass struggle for democracy, an underestimation of its achievements, a cynicism as to its value, a blindness with regard to the mass forces that make for historical progress and which unite politics and economics. This long-standing weakness has now brought Dr. Beard to full capitulation to that reaction which he tried to oppose during most of his active life.

Dr. Beard closes his remarkable essay on how to keep peace by collaborating with fascism, on a "high moral note." He thinks that "anybody who feels hot with morals and is affected with delicate sensibilities can find enough to do at home." While I yield nothing to Dr. Beard in moral heat against the miseries in America, I must protest against his attempt to use it to reduce our heat against the crimes being committed in Spain and China.

When I arrived in Barcelona last week, I visited many of the thirty-five apartment houses blown to bits by high-power bombs from Italian planes, dropped the day before, a sunny Sunday morning. I saw dismembered and mutilated babies and mothers being removed from the wreckage. In my mind rose the question, how long will it be before similar bombs drop on New York, Chicago, San Francisco, with similar results "at home" to our women and children—perhaps to my own family too. When I read the horrible dispatches from China, I see behind the grim statistics the faces of my many Chinese friends, most of them now corpses from the effect of Japanese bombs and machine guns.

What reason have we to assume that America is immune to

this madness that is sweeping the world? What reason have we to think we can shut ourselves away from it all, and with impunity wash our hands of the fate of our brothers in other lands?

When I see these things, I do indeed become "hot with morals," to use Dr. Beard's derisive phrase. And I cannot forgive Dr. Beard for that derision. It is a shameful and unworthy thing. As for me, I cannot rest until I know that I and the people which gave me birth, the American people, are doing everything in our power to stop these crimes in Spain and China, to make them unprofitable, and to make their recurrence impossible. That several thousand American boys are giving their lives in Spain to help do this job makes me proud of our people, and very humble that we are not doing more. Fascism must be stopped in those places where it first strikes. The Spanish and Chinese peoples are fighting the battles of all mankind. We must come to their help. We must stop all direct and indirect aid to the fascists. We must end once and for all the farce of "non-intervention." If we fail in this duty, then we deserve no better fate for ourselves, and I am sure we will get our deserts. There is no way forward for America, or for the world, except we find the way together, through concerted action for democracy and peace.

New Masses, March 1, 1938.

III

The Isolationist United Front

It will help throw light into the confused discussion on concerted action versus isolation, to examine the unprincipled and undeclared "united front" among the isolationists, which they put forward as a camp of "peace advocates."

First of all, their "Left wing": This found its classic expression in the "round robin" to the *Nation*, rebuking that journal for rejecting isolationism (*Nation*, January 22, p. 111). In the list of forty-five signers, we discern the following groupings: open Trotskyites, who for several years have worked in alliance with the fascist powers on the principle of serving their aims by "ultra-revolutionary" catch-words; Lovestoneites, who since 1935 passed to the Trotskyite position on all world issues; the Socialist Party leaders, since 1936 pitifully dependent upon Trotsky for all their central thoughts; the extremist-pacifists, for whom all struggle is anathema and destructive of social ends, and who, therefore, openly advocate capitulation before aggression at home and abroad; the primitive-Christians, who reach the same goal through ethical, "turn-the-other-cheek," considerations; the practical politicians, who see some future left in exploiting the naïve isolationism of the middle-western farmers and small-townsmen; and officials of the Auto Workers' Union who adopted a pro-Japanese resolution, under the influence of Trotskyite-Lovestoneite intriguers.

The claim of this group to be a "Left wing" is based upon its open or implied adherence to the Trotskyite thesis that democracy is not worth defending, that its defense will only

hasten its own destruction, that there is no essential difference between democracy and fascism, that the victory of fascism is inevitable, that fascism and war may even prove to be a good thing because they will hasten the downfall of capitalism and the consequent rise of a new society. The "Left wing" coloration is thus made an incentive to take up more boldly the slogans of the fascists themselves, and thus transform anti-fascist and peace sentiment into helpers of the fascist world-plan.

Typical of the "center" of the isolationist united front is David Stern and his newspaper chain, headed by the *New York Post*. Ostensibly "open-minded" and moved by immediately practical considerations to the exclusion of dogma, Stern and his associates drive consistently to the same end of extreme isolationism.

The "Right wing" of the isolationist agitators and propagandists among the masses is typically represented by Father Coughlin, by the *American Mercury* and the Hearst press. In them we have the case of isolationism presented in its most openly fascist form, with fully developed nationalism, chauvinism and frank admiration for the fascist dictators, as chief characteristics.

There is no hard-and-fast division between these various groups. On the contrary, there is quite a free collaboration between them. Thus O. G. Villard, "liberal," extends his public congratulations to Father Coughlin for returning to the air to uphold the isolationist cause, without even a blush for his new ally. Thus Norman Thomas and Hearst collaborated last November to blanket the news of the historic Congress for Peace and Democracy, with four and a half million members represented, by an isolationist blast against the congress written by Thomas, which was combined with a "Catholic" picket line to identify the congress with "Communism." Thus

Trotskyites boldly collaborate in the fascist *American Mercury*, and Bruce Bliven writes them "explanatory" letters.*

The main body of the isolationist propaganda machinery consists of the majority of the big newspapers of the country. They plug along, most of them, without any special ideological slant, broadcasting any and every variety of isolationism with magnificent impartiality. Equally impartial is the support given to all by the Nazi and fascist organizations in the United States, and by the open apologists for Japan.

This broad united front of the isolationists of all stripes is particularly in evidence in the past six months, since the great stream of public sentiment began to run in the direction of concerted action for peace, and especially since President Roosevelt's famous speech of October 5 in Chicago. All the isolationists are especially vindictive against the President because of that speech. But, being good practical politicians, they would like to avoid a head-on collision with the broad personal popularity of the President. Therefore, their arguments are seldom directed openly against the President; since the Communists support the President on this issue, and since the Communist Party is a small and weak group as yet, they find it convenient to direct their main polemic against the Communists. That may not be particularly honest and frank, but at least it is "smart" political tactics.

Our isolationists are, as a rule, desirous of keeping all discussions of war and peace quite separated from issues of domestic policy, and as far as possible on the plane of abstractions. But foreign policy is inevitably tied up very concretely with all issues of domestic life. Therefore, we will expect to find these groups and individuals prominent in the agitation of isolationism also tending to take up a common view on the chief domestic problems of the day.

In this expectation we will not be disappointed. Take the

* See p. 80 of this book.

issue of Roosevelt's proposals for curbing the Supreme Court. That was the question which most stirred our political life in 1937, which most hastened the growing political realignment of the country. And on this question, we will find that at least 95 per cent of the individuals and groups most vocal in fighting against the President's indication of a positive peace policy were equally vocal (and equally vicious) in opposing his proposal to deflate the Supreme Court. The same instincts, or the same logic, or the same class interests, which bring them to a common position on the one question, seem to work with equal precision to bring them to a common front on the other question. That is, of course, only natural and to be expected.

Behind all the difference between the various groups of isolationists, certain revealing uniformities can be traced in the structure of their arguments. Since it is these uniformities which constitute the basis for their united front, it is worth while tracing a few of the chief ones.

For example, examine the isolationist logic in evaluating the recent resignation of Eden from the British government, and Chamberlain's open conciliation with fascist aggression. One and all, the isolationists denounce the British course as a crime against humanity, and a proof that they were always right when they said it was impossible to establish a "united front of the democratic nations" that would include Britain; and then, in the same breath, they proceed to "prove" by the British example, that the only correct course for the United States is one closely copied after that of Chamberlain—that is, to hell with the rest of the world, make our own arrangements, and, above all, keep out of the way of the bandit nations, the fascist aggressors, and speak softly to them.

All groups of isolationists are agreed that the United States is, under all circumstances, incapable of pursuing an effective peace policy in collaboration with other nations. They dis-

agree only in their explanations why this is so. Some of them, like Norman Thomas, look upon the United States as equally a bandit with the fascist governments; the only way to keep the United States from doing mischief is to keep it from doing anything at all. Others, like many of the pacifists, think that on the contrary, the United States is of a Christlike purity of morals, which can only be preserved by cutting off all contacts with other nations. Still a third, and the largest, group is convinced that even with the best intentions in the world the United States goes into world affairs mortally handicapped by the superior abilities of other nations, especially Great Britain, to trick the United States out of our very shirt and pants; we are like the country boy going to the city, sure to be sold a gold brick by the city slickers. But, however much they differ as to the reasons, all isolationists are agreed upon the conclusion that the United States must at all costs keep out of world affairs and make no difficulties for the bandit nations.

Another item of common agreement among isolationists is their agreement that the Communists are a dangerous and pernicious influence, and especially so because of our advocacy of concerted action as the path to peace. The various groups place varied emphasis upon this idea, but all are agreed that the danger from this Communist influence is much more serious than the danger from fascist trends. For the Trotskyites, whose one function in life is to destroy the Communist movement by all means, the Communists are not only the chief but practically the only danger to world peace. Norman Thomas and his Socialist friends strongly incline to the Trotskyist view. The other groups adopt the idea to the varied degrees they are able to exploit it.

Most important of all their common ideas is the isolationist conception of the Soviet Union as the chief menace to the peace of the United States. It is of no consequence to demon-

strate to them that the Soviet Union is consistently, and from its very nature, an advocate of peace and prepared to co-operate with all peace-loving peoples to preserve peace. All evidence to prove that only convinces the isolationists all the more of the insidious role of the Soviet Union which would inveigle the United States into war precisely through the common interests of the Soviet Union and the United States in maintaining peace. They have a very strict logic in their inveterate hatred of the Soviet Union. It consists of the main proposition that the only way the bandit nations can be prevented from making war is to give them whatever they demand; the secondary proposition, that the Soviet Union, no matter how much it wants peace, will never agree to surrender to the fascists as the path to peace; and, conclusion, that therefore the Soviet Union is the enemy of peace, and everyone who wants peace by surrender to fascism should dissociate himself from the Soviet Union.

When one goes over all the ideas generally agreed upon among all the isolationist groups, ideas which form the basis for their united front among themselves, then one cannot but be struck by another feature of these ideas. They are not only held in common by the isolationist groups, but they form the basis of possible agreement with Hitler, Mussolini and the Mikado; the ideologists of the bandit nations are closely in sympathy, if not in agreement, with all these ideas. In fact, they consider the victory of these ideas in the United States as an essential step toward the general victory of fascism throughout the world. The ideas of isolationism are a necessary part of the fascist system in its march toward world conquest.

Thus it comes about that the sharper grows the world situation, the more are peace and democracy endangered by the advance of aggression by the bandit nations, then all the more do the isolationists, fighting desperately for withdrawal from world affairs by the United States, proceed step by step to

prove as a desperate last resort that democracy is an illusion which it is not worth risking anything to preserve; that peace itself is a questionable goal, not worthy of serious effort to maintain; that the natural, inevitable and perhaps desirable condition of the world is a wild and bloody scramble for its redivision; that in such a condition, the rule is each nation for itself, and the United States has nothing to do but keep its eyes open, preparing to join in the general blood-bath only after all others have seriously weakened themselves by fratricidal struggles which will open the way for America to grab the lion's share at a minimum risk for itself.

These logical conclusions of isolationism are, of course, not yet drawn consciously by all or even by a majority of those advocating isolation. But the more logical and consequential minds among them are visibly moving in that direction. They will all soon come to the point where they might either accept this as the main current of their thought, or else make a clean break with isolationism and take the only effective path to peace—the path of concerted and organized action by the peace-loving majority of the peoples of the world and their governments.

New Masses, March 8, 1938.

IV

The "Haves" and "Have-Nots"

Recent events, since I accepted your kind invitation to address the Carolina Political Union, serve to sharpen considerably the issues involved in finding an effective peace policy for the United States. The aggressions of the bandit governments have engulfed Austria, in the heart of Europe, and proclaim quite openly that Czechoslovakia is next. To the north of us, the province of Quebec seems to have been rather firmly seized by admirers and imitators of Hitler and Mussolini. To the immediate south, in Mexico, only the firm actions of President Cárdenas have forestalled a fascist putsch, inspired and directed from Europe with the collaboration of American vested interests.

Within the United States itself, the incitations of big business fascism to the assassination of President Roosevelt have become common knowledge; and in the last days has been added the revelation of a German spy-ring actively operating on our soil to purchase military secrets, especially regarding the defenses of the Panama Canal. The events in China continue their inexorable course, more obviously than ever involving the future of America.

In facing the problem of finding an effective policy to maintain peace and democracy, in a world where winds of war and fascism blow ever more wildly, the people of the United States are involved in deep confusion of counsel. In a world setting quite new, the disillusionments of the last World War are gathered into a system of deep-seated prejudices and call for the isolation of the United States from the rest of the world, which is to be allowed to go to hell in its own way, while the

United States finds its own path for itself alone. Against this naïve and irrational dream, there arises more and more the understanding that peace (and consequently democracy also) can be preserved only by the co-operative and concerted action of all peace-loving peoples of every country, and the governments whose policies they can still determine.

The central issue is the choice between isolationism or international concerted action as the path to peace. The greatest debate of our day is on this issue, which is gradually involving the whole of the thinking population.

The position of my Party, the Communist Party, has from the beginning of this discussion been definitely against isolationism and in favor of the path of concerted action.

Last year, during the discussions around the falsely-named Neutrality Act, we formulated our views with much precision, advocating legislation which would sharply distinguish between those governments which upheld their treaty obligations with the United States, under the Kellogg-Briand Pact and the Nine-Power Pact, and those which violated these obligations. We advocated that those governments which upheld their treaty obligations should be guaranteed freedom of access to the American market, and if necessary be assisted by credits when victims of the treaty-breakers; while the bandit governments, which dishonor their obligations, should be barred from access to American markets or credits. We advocated consultation between the United States and the governments maintaining their treaty obligation, to obtain the maximum concerted action along these lines to restrain the bandit governments.

Our sharpest criticism of President Roosevelt and his administration has been, for a long time, against their failure to come forward with such a positive peace policy; their apparent willingness to compromise with or surrender to the crudest isolationism is exemplified in the infamous Neutrality Act and

its special application against loyalist Spain, while the bandit nations continue to draw war materials from American markets.

Therefore, when President Roosevelt made his peace speech in Chicago, on October 5, indicating a turn away from isolationism and toward concerted action, we of the Communist Party gave immediate and unstinted support to this declaration of policy, and called upon the people to demand its practical application. We recognize full well all the difficulties that beset the implementation of this policy, but we also recognize that the only alternative is the drift to certain disaster.

Such is the confusion in public debate in these days, that there are still people who reject President Roosevelt's Chicago speech, either wholly or entirely upon the grounds that the Communists support it, and therefore it must be wrong. What would such people, most of them good Christians no doubt, answer to a Communist declaration of support of the Ten Commandments? Let us hope that, in a day in which the Communists more and more find themselves in agreement on current issues with great sections of our population, and often even with a majority, to refute such argumentation will soon be unnecessary. At least I hope that with this audience I need not demonstrate that those who reject Communism as a program of social reorganization, need not necessarily take an opposite position to that of the Communists on every issue of the day, that our arguments should be dealt with on their merits on each question under discussion.

Another appeal to prejudice that is made by enemies of the policy of concerted action consists in charging that this is a special interest of the Soviet Union; since this policy is also supported by the Soviet Union, this is proof, they say, that the whole policy is a clever trap by Stalin to trick America into fighting his battles. Even David Stern, the supposed New Deal newspaper publisher, issued a hysterical outburst to this effect on the occasion of Stalin's recent letter in which he

pointed out that maintenance of peace is an international problem, can only be solved by the international action of those who want peace, primarily the workers, and concluded that it is necessary for the Soviet Union to pursue such a peace policy that will win the support of the workers of the capitalist lands so that they will help restrain the war-makers.

It is not necessary to be an enthusiastic supporter of the Soviet Union, and an admirer of Stalin, as I am, in order to see the falsity and downright dishonesty of such appeals to prejudice. First of all, the policy of concerted action for peace, or "collective security" as they say in Europe, was first enunciated by the French republic—before the People's Front came to power there. Then it was adopted by the League of Nations, with the withdrawal of the bandit governments from that body as a consequence. The Soviet Union came into the picture to support a peace policy already worked out by all the democracies of the world except the United States; and at the same time it greatly improved its relations with the United States.

Surely even the most rabid enemy of the social and economic system in the Soviet Union must, if he is really an advocate of international peace, welcome joyfully the accession of that great power to the peace alignment of the world. No one who is ready to base his opinions strictly on the record can deny that the Soviet Union has been the most consistent supporter, in word and deed, of world peace and disarmament as its needs have been formulated by the great body of democratic nations in the world. Stalin's letter was a further rallying of the one hundred and eighty million population of the Soviet Union in the cause of peace; instead of attacking him for it, it would be more to the point if his non-Communist or anti-Communist critics should demonstrate that they also, from their own point of view, can help arouse the masses of the United States for an equally energetic attempt to restrain the bandit governments from further engulfing the world in war.

But the viewpoint of isolationism leads its defenders into ever more irrational and reactionary positions. For the broad masses who are influenced by isolationist moods and sentiments, largely as a disillusionment with the hypocrisies of the imperialist World War, isolationism is in reality a peace sentiment unilluminated by any consistent political thinking through of the problem. But for the political leaders and ideologists of isolationism, who must face and answer all questions, and who must draw the logical consequences of their position or abandon it, isolationism very rapidly is becoming a deliberate abandonment of the ideal of peace, of all struggle to maintain peace.

The greatest danger in our public life today is this, that under cover of isolationism, to which great masses adhere as a peace sentiment, there is being broadcast a spirit of cynicism toward peace as a goal to be striven for, and as a consequence also toward the very idea of democracy.

We Communists are often attacked as enemies of democracy in general and of American democracy in particular. That was never true, for we have always been adherents of democracy; that is less true than ever today, for since democracy is being actively threatened by the rise of fascism, we Communists have come forward as its most consistent and self-sacrificing defenders.

We are, of course, keenly aware of the limitations of democracy under the modern capitalist system. This democracy based upon private property in the means of production has even lost much of the strength of its early period, because it has largely lost its economic foundation. Where one hundred and fifty years ago widespread distribution of private property, based upon individual production, was itself something of a guarantee, while it lasted, of the democratic rights and powers of the mass of the people, such private property today has largely disappeared, and has been replaced by giant cor-

porations which occupy all the commanding heights of the national economy. This corporate economy is the antithesis of democracy; its control is the acme of self-perpetuating oligarchy, with the oligarchs constantly diminishing in number, a small fraction of one per cent of the population exercising decisive power over the whole economy upon which the livelihood of all depends.

So long as the democratic forms of government follow the leadership of the oligarchs of industry, the economic royalists, these forms are tolerated and even defended by them. When, however, as today has clearly shown, there is a conscious split between the mass of the democratic electorate, and the economic rulers, then as President Roosevelt pointed out in his Constitution Day speech last year, the economic royalists begin to question why they should continue to support a democracy which threatens to curtail their special privileges, and they begin to turn toward fascism. This is the danger of fascism from within our country, that rises simultaneously with the fascist aggression from abroad and develops in conscious collaboration with the foreign fascist powers.

That is why it is impossible effectively to fight against reaction and the war-mongers at home, without at the same time fighting the same forces internationally, and vice versa. It is the height of futility, and that means, in the last analysis, of stupidity, to try to follow a domestic policy of a progressive, democratic and peaceful character, and at the same time in foreign affairs to be "neutral" as between fascist and democratic, between war-making and peace-seeking governments, to retreat before and surrender to the bandit governments.

Precisely to that futility does isolationism lead some of our best intentioned and energetic progressives. For example, no one can question the honest progressivism and good intentions of Congressman Maury Maverick. And yet his isolationist prejudices caused him to draw back, to withhold his name,

from one of the most historic demonstrations of American democracy's solidarity with world democracy. I refer to that splendid greeting by sixty-six Senators and Representatives of the United States Congress sent to the meeting of the Cortes, parliament of the Spanish republic, when it met on February 2 in the midst of a life-and-death struggle with the international bandits. No, Maury Maverick had been so poisoned by isolationism that he considered it dangerous to American peace even to express congratulations to the Spanish parliament because it was still alive, meeting and fighting the fascist invasion to the death. Even to express good will to the Spanish republic, he fears, may bring the wrath of the bandit governments down upon our American heads.

What Maverick forgets, with those who think along the same lines, is this: If Hitler and Mussolini can already, from so far away, dictate so thoroughly what the Mavericks may do and say in America, then indeed American democracy has already gone a long way along the road of surrender, and it is not much farther to the establishment of a fascist dictatorship upon our own soil.

So, also, it is the pacifist funk of isolationism which leads our Mavericks into such childish blind-alleys as the belief that with such paper weapons as the Ludlow amendment, or the kind of fight they are making against the Naval Appropriation Bill, they are really fighting for peace. Nothing could be more dangerous to peace than precisely the Ludlow proposal; in a period when the chief characteristic of wars is that they are *not declared*, it turns its whole attention to the problem of the technique of declaring war. At a moment when all energies should be turned to preparing the conditions for peace, it turns all attention away to the problem of making war difficult to declare on the side of one of the chief peaceful powers. And in fighting the huge naval appropriations, this is done by emphasizing a hundredfold precisely that condition which

furnishes the chief influence behind these huge expenditures, namely, the conviction that in a hostile and war-mad world the United States can co-operate with and trust no other nation, people or group, nor even trust its own President to follow a real peace policy. These are the logical fruits of isolationism, which cultivates national exclusiveness, chauvinism, division from other peace-loving peoples, suspicion and distrust, and finally cynicism even toward the very ideas of peace and democracy.

As a matter of fact, capable of verification, it is exactly this fear of and retreat before fascist aggression that itself creates the danger of further fascist attack. Every concession to fascism has led to new aggressions; but in those few instances when the democratic powers sharply challenged the bandits, precisely those were the few times when the bandits drew back and showed some respect, however brief, for something besides their own mad appetites. All the hypocrisies of the Non-Intervention Committee only encouraged Mussolini and Hitler to spit in their faces and redouble their intervention in Spain; but the Nyon Conference, in a few hours culminating in sharp decisions, brought the submarine piracy to at least a temporary halt—and decreased the immediacy of general war. France was placed in mortal danger, not by coming to the help of the Spanish republic, but precisely by refusing to do so, a danger that was partially overcome, not increased, when France finally began in a small way to counter big-scale fascist intervention for Franco by some small favors to the republic. The Soviet Union strengthened itself against fascist aggression, and did not further endanger itself, when it generously provided the Spanish republic with the needed supplies when all others had run away in fright before the fascist threats. Concessions to fascism, fear of fascism, retreat before fascism, these are not ways to peace; on the contrary, they are

the infallible way to a general world war that will involve also the United States.

Examine how the isolationist newspapers have treated the recent developments in Great Britain, and you will find dramatic exposure of the fundamental unsoundness of their position. Almost universally these newspapers expressed two thoughts: first, that Chamberlain had betrayed democracy and world peace, specifically that "he had let us down," when he threw Eden into the discard, and openly went toward capitulation to fascism; second, that this proves that the policy of the United States should be modeled along Chamberlain's lines, that is, go it alone, make the best possible bargains for ourselves, and to hell with the rest of the world. Truly, a marvelous logic, which brands Chamberlain's crime only to urge the same course upon Washington. It is the logic of such cynicism that can result only in open acceptance of fascism in full, if followed to its conclusion.

But there were two sides to the British events, while our isolationists see but one. The other side is this: that Eden's open challenge and resignation, followed by the Labor Party's going over to active opposition and appealing to the country, and a split within British imperialism itself shown in the opposition of Winston Churchill and Lloyd George, two old warhorses of British imperialism, all go to demonstrate how near to complete collapse is the Chamberlain policy of surrender to the bandits. The greatest threat against a general united front of the democratic nations to halt fascism was always the almost solid front gathered around the Baldwin-Chamberlain line of equivocation and compromise, a united front that included even the Labor Party. That is now smashed to bits, and the broad democratic forces in Britain, first of all the labor movement, are now released to fight for their own natural line of resistance to fascism, a line which can be enormously strengthened and brought closer to victory by demonstrating

that in the United States it finds sympathetic understanding and the possibility of future co-operation.

The isolationists make the assumption that a policy of concerted action to halt fascism would be immensely expensive for the United States, whereas, they argue, isolation would be very economical. Nothing could be further from the truth. To halt fascism now will entail a minimum of economic cost for the United States. The main burden of the job is already undertaken by the immediate victims of fascist aggression, and with a little help, enough to bring them the victory they are promising to win even alone, they will save us from the gigantic bill of having to do the job alone later on. But a consistent policy of isolation will quickly become, directly and indirectly, an enormous economic expense. Indirectly it will saddle us with the future costs of dealing single-handed with the bandit powers. Already it is responsible for the enormous military burdens that are being laid upon the country, upon the theory that we must go it alone. Directly, with the spread of war, isolation will result in such far-reaching economic dislocations as to make the losses of the 1929-33 crisis look small in comparison.

Some of the isolationist propagandists are already playing with the idea that, if the Soviet Union can develop its own self-contained economy which, even while doing business with the rest of the world as far as possible, is quite independent of the course of world capitalist economy, then the United States also, with its much higher development of productive powers, can shut itself off from the rest of the world and make economic advances equal or comparable to those of the Soviet Union.

There is only one little thing wrong with this calculation. It forgets that the Soviet Union could make its tremendous economic advances, in the face of a world of crisis and economic retrogression outside its borders, only by virtue of its

unique social and economic organization, in which private capitalists and profits are entirely eliminated, and in which the entire economy can be directed to the single end of raising the general living standards of the population, an aim limited by but one factor—the needs of defense from outside aggression. We have nothing of the kind in the United States, and our isolationists do not propose to give us anything of the kind. We have capitalism in our country, with the economy directed by the single aim of making profits for the benefit, primarily, of the "sixty families," our economic royalists. Leaving aside all arguments of whether this is good or bad, advisable or inadvisable, necessary or unnecessary, one central fact is clearly demonstrable—that given this capitalist system, the sudden cutting off of the United States from the world market or any considerable portion of it would precipitate an economic crisis that would inevitably result in upheaval, and some kind of sudden and drastic change in our system of government and the direction of our policies. Capitalism, in its modern stage presented in the United States today, cannot be cut off from its world connections without undergoing profound convulsions and deepgoing modifications. Application in practice of the policy of isolation, carried to its logical conclusions, would quickly defeat itself.

Propagandists for isolationism, seeking to discredit the policy of concerted action for peace by identifying it with unpopular symbols, go hunting with a double-barreled shotgun. One barrel contains the charge that collective security is a Communist conspiracy, or "orders from Moscow." With this I have already dealt. But the other barrel contains the much more deadly charge, that collective security is a Wall Street conspiracy, that it proposes to make war for American imperialist interests. Although these mutually contradictory charges are fired from the same gun, by the same marksmen, and should logically cancel one another, I often find it is not safe to depend upon

logic alone, but that it is necessary to give concrete answers to all, even the most contradictory charges.

One of the most interesting examples I have seen of this was contained in an "open letter," signed by forty-five isolationists who consider themselves of the "Left wing," published in the *Nation* of January 22. Rebuking the *Nation* for its support of President Roosevelt's quarantine proposals, these pacifist-isolationists fire point-blank with the second barrel of the shotgun. They say:

> The *Nation* seems to have ignored the embarrassing fact that at the time of the attack the *Panay* was convoying three Standard Oil tankers. Indeed, in its editorial of December 18 these tankers were actually described as "three American ships containing American refugees." Is this liberalism?

There we have the full argument, in all its glory. Since American ships, outside of naval units, are necessarily private capitalist ships, even "imperialist" ships, and perhaps even Standard Oil tankers, therefore "liberalism" demands that if they are in Chinese waters and the Japanese army and navy order them out, and proceed to bomb them out of existence, they shall obey the Japanese orders or take the consequences without any protest from American liberalism. Against Standard Oil tankers, this "liberalism" demands for the Japanese bandits a free hand. And if the *Nation*, a liberal magazine, joins the world-wide protest against the Japanese bandits, this "liberalism" of the "Left-wing" isolationists hastens to the help of the Japanese with the "embarrassing fact" that the *Nation* is really defending the profits of Standard Oil.

The *Nation's* crime, in their eyes, is all the worse, because it described these tankers as "three American ships containing American refugees." That the ships actually did contain American refugees is only another of those devilishly clever tricks for which Standard Oil is famous. But Norman Thomas

and his friends will expose this trick, and with "true liberalism" will hand over to Japan the liberal privileges of doing what it wishes not only with the Chinese people but also with any Americans who fail to obey their orders and get out of China and stay out—especially if they are fleeing on Standard Oil tankers.

Thus does isolationism come to the service of the Japanese bandits, betray the Chinese people and surrender American rights—all in the name of fighting against Standard Oil and American imperialism! Truly, it is a wonderful "Left wing" that lines up with William Randolph Hearst, Hamilton Fish, Father Coughlin and Norman Thomas, with the common demand that we get out of China precisely when the Chinese want us to stay and the Japanese army and navy has ordered us out. You will excuse us Communists if we say that this kind of "Left wing" smells awfully bad to us, and we have nothing in common with it.

The isolationists are determined that nothing shall be allowed to disturb the serenity of their "neutrality." Therefore their main interest in life is to prove that all foreign governments are equally bad, the fascist bandits no worse than those of the democratic countries, and perhaps even a little better since they have the virtue of frankness. And, above all, they would engage our sympathies on the side of the bandit powers and against the democracies by describing the bandits as the "have not," the "proletarians among the nations," and the democracies as the "haves," whose wealth is to blame for the aggression of the bandits.

How false and misleading is this facile classification of "haves" and "have nots," instead of the correct one of "peaceful" and "war-making" governments, is clear from the most cursory examination of events leading up to today's world crisis. Was Manchuria one of the "haves" in 1931, when Japan grabbed it by force? Was Ethiopia one of the "haves," even

as compared with poverty-stricken Italy, when Mussolini raped this backward but peaceful nation? Is Spain one of the "haves" to incite Mussolini and Hitler to their invasion? Is Austria one of the "haves" as compared with Germany, to excuse Hitler's latest aggression? Is Czechoslovakia, next on Hitler's list, one of the "haves"? Is China, bleeding from the ferocious Japanese assault, paying for the sin of being more wealthy than Japan? And if the "have" and "have not" classification used to drum up sympathy for the bandit nations by our isolationists, really means that they propose to divide up the wealth of the world in favor of the bandits to buy them off, do our isolationists propose that the United States, with almost half the wealth of the world, is to present the bandits with its proportionate share of the bribe? Merely to ask these questions is to expose the hypocritical dishonesty of the "have" and "have not" classification as nothing but an empty apology for the war-makers, to excuse and condone their violent seizure of the weakest and most "have not" countries.

That does not, of course, mean that the greatest and richest democracies are not in danger. England, France and the United States are certainly in deadly danger. England is in danger, before all, because she is ruled by a group which is more and more tending to enter into partnership with fascism. France is in danger, before all, because her "two hundred families" and their agents are in league with Hitler and Mussolini, and conspire a fascist *coup d'état* with their help. The United States is in danger because our "economic royalists," holding economic power unparalleled in history, are moving toward fascism. All the democracies are in danger, because of the confusion of their counsels, and their inability hitherto to find a common path to ensure peace. It is these dangers from within the democracies that give menacing power to the drive toward world conquest by the bandit dictators.

The fight to maintain peace and democracy, to halt the

march of the war-makers and fascists, is the precondition for all hopes of human progress today. This task must unite all the forces of progress among the people, regardless of our differences on other questions, all progressive Democrats and Republicans, Socialists and Communists, and especially the great mass of working people and farmers.

We of the Communist Party have our own particular views about the necessities of future progress of the United States and of the world. We believe that the final solution of all our problems will require the transfer of our national economy from private ownership to social ownership and operation for the common benefit of all. We will continue to do our utmost to convince the majority of the American people to that program. But we are keenly aware that a relatively small minority of the population as yet share our views on this fundamental reorganization. We have a long and arduous task of education ahead of us, before we can lead a majority of the American people to the establishment of socialism. And in the meantime we want to do everything in our power to prevent the victory of fascism, and the consequent world disaster of war, which would throw back the prospects of socialism together with all progress into the mire of universal catastrophe. This view we share with the majority of the people. We want to help organize that majority to secure guarantees against fascism and war.

On the basis of these views, the Communist Party offers its co-operation to all honest democrats, progressives and lovers of peace. We have given the utmost guarantees of the solidity and permanence of our policy, in the self-sacrificing performance of our tasks in building the democratic front. We have earned our place as recognized participants in this democratic front. No one can deny us this place, except by adopting the Hitlerian formula of the "anti-Communist" alliance of the bandit powers, by capitulation to the enemy before the fight is well under way.

But America will certainly reject the Hitler slogans. America

will resume her old proud place in the vanguard of world progress. America will not turn aside toward a vain and false isolation. America will take a leading part in preserving the world, and thereby herself, from the disasters of fascism and war. America will take the path toward concerted action of all the peaceful and democratic forces of the world. Our present capacities and our past history join in giving us this assurance. We of the Communist movement will do our best to help realize this promise.

Address delivered before the Carolina Political Union at Chapel Hill, N. C., March 3, 1938.

V

The Trade Unions and Peace

NOWHERE is the national debate on concerted action versus isolation being conducted more seriously than in the trade unions. And nowhere will the results be more important, for the trade union movement is the backbone of the democratic camp against fascism and war. There is no possibility for a determined course of concerted action without the wholehearted backing of the organized working class.

It is therefore highly important to know what are the currents of trade union thought arising out of the great debate now going on.

As late as a year ago, the trade union movement in its large majority was dominated by isolationist moods and ideas, and in general tended to ignore world affairs. In this it was but continuing uncritically the course adopted after the disillusionment of the first post-war period out of which arose the whole isolationist tendency.

With the sharpening of the war danger, however, the trade unions have followed the general trend to revaluate the whole question. The trend of their debates on the question has been in the direction, more and more, of taking up the position of concerted action and rejecting isolation. This is in accord with the historic tendency of organized labor away from narrow nationalism and toward internationalism.

Taking the labor movement as a whole, it cannot be said that the trade unions stand in the vanguard of the movement for a peace policy based on concerted action. But some sections of the labor movement are standing in the forefront.

First of all should be considered the trade unions which

are connected with the American League for Peace and Democracy (formerly the American League Against War and Fascism). In its Third Congress, in the beginning of 1936, the League had representation of unions combining about 650,000 members; at the Fourth Congress, in November, 1937, the representation rose to over 1,600,000, while additional unions not represented but endorsing the League's program brought the total to well over 2,000,000. This is 25 to 30 per cent of the organized labor movement.

More significant than the rise in numbers, however, is the change in political outlook. At the 1936 congress, the trade unions shared the isolationist moods which caused that congress to adopt a program which straddled the issue of concerted action versus isolation. But in the 1937 congress, the trade unions were in the forefront of the great swing in sentiment which placed the American League squarely upon the side of concerted action.

Upon the issue of peace policy, there is not discernible any clear differentiation between the two main centers of trade unionism, the A. F. of L. and the C.I.O., their differences being mainly in their modes of expressing themselves. The A. F. of L. discourages expression from its lower bodies, and tries to concentrate its pronouncements on peace in the higher officials, while the C.I.O. shies away from taking a position in its higher councils, but grants full freedom of expression in its lower and constituent bodies. The result is that, with the current being toward concerted action for peace in both main branches of the movement, this is shown by the C.I.O. unions mainly through their industrial and local branches, while in the A. F. of L. it is in the main through the expressions of the leaders.

However deep may be the discrepancy between the views of members and leaders of the A. F. of L. on many questions, there is no reason to doubt that on the issue of peace policy the dominant trend was expressed by William Green in the *Ameri-*

can Federationist for February, 1938. Precisely because we of the Communist Party are in sharp collision with Mr. Green on other questions, it becomes all the more necessary to register an important degree of approval of his expressions on this question of peace. The following quotations, taken from William Green's editorial, are fundamentally correct and become of high significance because they represent the views of the main body of the more conservative camp of trade unionism. Mr. Green said:

When the first European country initiated a war of aggression to extend its territories, no concerted effort was made to maintain the integrity of the nation attacked and to maintain respect for international peace and law. Under protection of this international situation Japan made her first raid on China. . . . As a consequence Europe lives in fear of the shot that will proclaim general war. Since the life of the civilized world is organized on a world basis, it is practically impossible for any nation to live within itself, and no nation can escape becoming involved in a general war. The only way to protection against irresponsible nations and to world peace is to set up international agencies for adjusting our common problems and for enforcing the peace of the world. In other words, we must extend to international relations political organization that will reclaim this area from anarchy and conflict.

The majority of the citizens of the United States deeply resent the action of Japan in making an unprovoked invasion of China and waging war upon her civilian population, threatening to destroy one of the oldest civilizations. We condemn such action as do many other countries, but only concerted action can make Japan feel the effects of our disapproval. The A. F. of L. has urged its membership to boycott the manufactured goods of Japan. While that action has been effective, we realize that only a general boycott can bring the desired economic pressure on Japan. We realize that unless the democratically governed people stand together refusing to sell arms and munitions or to make loans to any country violating international peace and law, the other countries, whose interests lie in aggression and arbitrary rule, will make common cause with Japan, and protests of individual countries will be useless.

The central core of Mr. Green's argumentation, namely, the indivisibility of peace and the necessity for concerted action to maintain it, is sound and incontrovertible, notwithstanding that some formulations reveal reactionary prejudices and nationalist preconceptions. In practice, of course, Mr. Green and his associates do not carry out this line. They are opposing international trade union unity, they betray republican Spain, they stultify their boycott activities against Japan by placing it under the Hearstian slogan of "Buy only American goods." Yet it is certainly a fact to be welcomed that the American Federation of Labor is predominantly on the side of concerted action for peace. We can only applaud the main thought expressed by Mr. Green, and demand that the A. F. of L. apply it in life.

The Atlantic City conference of the unions of the Committee for Industrial Organization, held in October, 1937, like the A. F. of L. convention in Denver at that time, adopted a decision for boycott of Japanese goods. It did not, however, adopt a general peace policy.

The first and clearest declaration of policy from the C.I.O. unions came from the convention of the National Maritime Union last summer. It declared for embargo against aggressor governments, help to their victims and concerted action among the peace-loving and treaty-maintaining peoples. This clear-headed and well-formulated resolution was a model of working-class internationalism. It is no accident that it could be unanimously adopted by precisely this union, ahead of the whole labor movement, because the seamen, from the very nature of their work and life, are compelled to think hard and deep and realistically on all questions of war and peace.

In the United Mine Workers' convention, held last December, we had the expression of the largest and most influential union of the C.I.O. The resolution adopted was noteworthy, on its positive side, for its forthright condemnation of Ger-

many, Italy and Japan as aggressors making war "to impose their vicious principles" upon democratic and weaker nations, and for its resolute endorsement of the boycott of Japanese goods. It was further noteworthy for its decisive rejection of all the nostrums of isolationism, and for the emphatic rejection of an attempt to amend the resolution to include a condemnation of Communism. Thus the United Mine Workers took decisive steps away from isolationism, and voided the fascist trap of the anti-Communist alliances, although it failed to give positive expression to a rounded-out program for concerted action.

The Ohio State Convention of the C.I.O. unions, held in February of this year, representing 250,000 members, adopted a resolution repeating the decisive sections of the Mine Workers' resolution, but adding, significantly, endorsement of the O'Connell Peace Bill (H.R. 527) which provides for embargo of the aggressors and help to their victims.

About the same time, the Labor Legislative Conference of Western Pennsylvania, representing several hundred thousand members, took President Roosevelt's Chicago speech proposing quarantine of the fascist governments as the central point for its resolution, which was unanimously adopted. This brief resolution, remarkable for the conciseness with which it declares for a policy of concerted action, is worth quoting in full:

> The people of the world are face to face with a new world war with all its devastation, bloodshed and death. The war-mad fascists, Hitler, Mussolini and the Mikado, threaten civilization and the peace of all humanity. From this war there will be no escape unless we protest and vigorously oppose this threatening war menace.
>
> The American people being opposed to war and desirous to maintain peace must add their support to the efforts of all peace-loving people throughout the world to maintain peace and save itself and all humanity from destruction. Therefore be it
>
> Resolved: That this Social and Labor Conference declares its opposition to the war plans of the fascist war aggressors and pledges

to support the peace policies of our President for co-operation with the people of all nations for the maintenance of peace and against fascist war aggression.

Such expressions as we have noted above are typical of the American labor movement's trend of thought in the national debate now going on. They show a tremendous movement to break away from isolationism, and to find the path to peace in concerted international action, in which the United States should take a leading role commensurate with our position in the world.

One important exception to this trend must be noted in the leadership of the Auto Workers' Union, mainly expressed by its president, Homer Martin. In the past few months Mr. Martin has stepped forward as a national leader of the isolationist camp, in fact almost its only important trade union figure. He appeared recently at a New York meeting of the isolationist "united front," which its chairman, Mr. Villard, announced had been organized by "the tireless energy of Mr. Bertram Wolfe," another of the speakers. Mr. Wolfe, it so happens, is a "tireless" member of the Lovestone group, closely associated internationally with the Bukharin-Brandler group, exposed as agents of the fascist governments actively engaged in inciting and preparing war. Mr. Martin, who seems to be particularly ignorant on international questions, takes his policy predigested from his close associate, Lovestone, and openly demands complete acceptance of the demands of Japanese imperialism by the United States government. His isolationist shouting is handy, at this moment, to obscure the unfortunate position in which his policies, under the guidance of Lovestone, have placed the auto union in relation to the labor-hating auto corporations.

The exceptional position of Mr. Martin among labor leaders, as an extreme isolationist, can hardly be taken as an expression

of the real trend of thought among the broad mass of auto workers. The auto workers, like the miners, steel workers and others who adopted the clear-cut decisions for concerted action in Ohio and Pennsylvania, are unquestionably breaking away from isolationism. If they had an opportunity to make a choice by ballot, between President Roosevelt's Chicago speech of last October, and Mr. Martin's recent New York speech, there is not the slightest doubt that they would support Roosevelt against Martin by an overwhelming majority.*

Closely connected with the trade unions are such mass political movements as the Minnesota Farmer-Labor Party which controls the state administration, and the Washington Commonwealth Federation which is a rising political power in its state. Both these great organizations are definitely on record for concerted action for peace and against isolationism.

Summing up, we can say on the basis of the evidence that the trade union movement as a whole, both A. F. of L. and C.I.O., is rapidly breaking away from the isolationist moods and ideas which dominated it for many years. It is, with various degrees of clarity, already adopting the basic principles of a program of concerted action of all peace-loving peoples to restrain the war-makers. It will certainly, in the not distant future, become the most solid, consistent and determined fighter to realize in life, in the practical actions of the United States government, the principles of collective security.

New Masses, March 22, 1938.

* Since this was written Homer Martin has not only been exposed and driven out of the U.A.W. as an enemy of labor, but he has been so thoroughly smashed on this issue that his own rump convention abandoned his position as untenable even for it and adopted a resolution for collective security.

VI

The Naval Bill and a Peace Program

Last week Maury Maverick made a speech in the House, in which his main point was the declaration that the Communists are for the Naval Appropriations Bill. Later, to substantiate his point, he gave the *New York Times* some extracts from my speech in Chapel Hill to the Carolina Political Union.*

Certainly we Communists have criticized, and continue to do so, Maverick's way of fighting the big naval appropriations. But we have never endorsed the enormous naval proposals, directly or indirectly. Our friend Maury was indulging in a little old-fashioned demagogy when he made that speech. Of course, something must be forgiven a man who is in a tough spot, who feels the ineffectiveness of his arguments, and who, therefore, is casting about desperately for new points which will appeal to the prejudices of his audience. In Congress, as in the New York Assembly at Albany, there seems to be a majority ready to outlaw the multiplication table if it can be proved that the Communists have endorsed it. Since the small Communist Party endorses the United States Constitution, these gentlemen have been deeply embarrassed; they have stopped talking about the Constitution for fear they might be suspected of having established secret connections with the Communists.

Maverick's pleasantries, however, cannot hide the deep seriousness of the problem that is posed, when he and other progressives abdicate the field of foreign policy in favor of the reactionaries. Maverick and Senator LaFollette, by their stand

* See pp. 39-54.

MOURN NOT THE DEAD

Mourn not the dead . . .
But rather mourn the apathetic throng,
The cowed and meek,
Who see the world's great anguish and its wrong
And dare not speak.

on the question of peace and how to maintain it, are decisively strengthening the hands of the reactionary forces which they fight against so admirably on domestic questions.

Maverick and LaFollette are, to do them exact justice, not leaders of isolationism so much as its victims. Neither of them has contributed any independent thought to the question, but rather they reproduce and express the isolationist moods and prejudices of their particular social backgrounds. Neither is a "convinced" isolationist as yet, in the deeper sense of having thought the question through to its end, faced all the consequences, and finally adopted isolationism knowing what inevitably flows from it. This fact gives us a right to hope that neither of them are as yet lost to the camp of concerted action for peace. Both of them, surely, will review the whole question again when their constituents back home swing over to a positive peace policy. In this sense they are practical men.

Senator LaFollette, for example, certainly did not know when he spoke on March 6 in New York at an "isolationist" meeting, that the organizer of that meeting, Bertram D. Wolfe, is a member of the Lovestone group, which is connected with the Bukharin group that admitted its organic relations with the Japanese secret service. He surely did not notice that, from the same platform with him, Wolfe gave out the slogan calling for the defeat of America in any conflict with Japan. Norman Thomas was there with full knowledge, but LaFollette was in the fullest sense an "innocent" on all these things.

Congressman Maverick is reported to have passed the judgment on Norman Thomas, not long ago, that "he insists, on principle, upon always being in a minority." But the same criticism seems to have a special application to Maverick himself, when he throws his influence on the side of isolation, and thus builds up the very foundation of the big navy advocates, and then, to save his conscience, fights against the big navy

bill which his isolationism has helped make certain of adoption by an overwhelming majority.

No one doubts that the overwhelming majority of the American people are for peace, against war. But at the same time an equally large majority, if Congress is an even approximate measure, approves the big naval appropriations. The reason for this is the fact that the United States actually stands alone in the world, without as yet any practical program of collaboration with other peace forces in the world, and without any program for making its own influence felt in restraining the war-makers, but, on the contrary, a practical program which is encouraging and helping the war-makers. So long as the United States stands alone, and is itself contributing to the war danger in the world, the simple common sense of the masses will continue to align them behind the big navy advocates as the obvious answer to the war-making forces that threaten world peace.*

Maverick is opposed to the proposed enormous increase of the navy. So are we of the Communist Party. Maverick has a splendid opportunity to reach the ear of the country with his position in Congress as Democratic leader of the progressives, in a Democratic Congress, while we of the Communist Party are a small and persecuted group, able to reach no ears except through our own limited channels. And yet I venture to say that, despite our handicaps, the Communists are convincing ten times as many people to oppose the big naval increase as Maverick can convince. That is because we, first of all, undermine and destroy the prejudices of isolationism which are at the foundation of the big navy idea, while Maverick supports isolation but stops short only of its logical consequence in the naval appropriations.

Let this much be clear. The naval bill is the inevitable con-

*Compare p. 206 ff. for the development of this question following the Munich betrayal of September-October, 1938.

clusion to the policy of "neutrality" and isolation, that still remains the practical foreign policy of the United States. No matter how much we Communists vote together with the Mavericks against a big navy, so long as isolation remains our practical foreign policy the vast expansion of the navy will be carried over our dwindling votes. But to the degree that all progressives, including the Communists, can swing the country to a practical policy of concerted action for peace, to that extent we also organize the masses to cut naval and military expenditures by making them obviously unnecessary.

There is still much confused thinking, caused by confusion as to what is really the policy of the United States government. Some people think that because President Roosevelt made a strong speech for concerted action to restrain the war-makers on October 5, 1937, at Chicago, therefore the policy of the United States government is no longer an isolationist policy. And because last Thursday, Secretary of State Hull made an international radio broadcast along these same lines, they become confirmed in their impression. But, unfortunately, it is not true.

Roosevelt's speech was a splendid contribution toward a change in policy—but it did not yet bring about the change. Hull's speech registered a continuing and growing determination to change—but the change is still not made. These speeches are, of course, also political acts in some degree, and influence the world, because they *promise* (or threaten!) to change American practical policy. But meanwhile—and this is the rub—practical policy remains isolationist.

And that is the central contradiction in the Roosevelt administration, from which spring a hundred paradoxes. The gap between word and deed becomes the more glaring, the more international relations sharpen, the more imminent becomes the war danger.

Litvinov spoke to the world also on Thursday, on behalf of the Soviet Union. He suggested an international conference to organize restraint of the war-makers. The spirit and direction of his declaration were in close harmony with the speech of Hull. No one can doubt that the entire Soviet Union is behind Litvinov's initiative with full strength. But Washington has not responded as yet to Moscow's proposal. The reason is this, that while Litvinov's speech represented the considered policy of the whole Soviet government and people, Hull's speech represented an *aspiration* toward a policy, while the practical policy being carried out is still the opposite.

This fact was dramatically emphasized by the simultaneous bombardment of Barcelona, with the killing and wounding of over four thousand people, mostly women and children, by German and Italian airplanes *carrying ammunition made in the United States.* In the same week boats sailed from Baltimore for Germany carrying two thousand additional aerial bombs, to replace those just dropped on Barcelona. Japanese and German boats continued to load and ship American scrap iron, for the making of shrapnel to kill Chinese and Spanish women and children. And at the same time President Roosevelt declared no move will be made to lift the embargo against the Spanish republic, even though it is in violation of our solemn treaty obligations to that nation.

The United States is every day helping the fascist war-makers in a practical way, while reading them moral lessons in speeches. The United States is denouncing the treaty breakers, but at the same moment is breaking its own treaty with the Spanish nation. The United States places an embargo against the weak and helpless victims of aggression, who could not threaten us if they would and who would not if they could, but it carefully refrains from an embargo against the strong aggressors, who threaten the peace of the whole world.

What a picture of blatant hypocrisy all this must appear to the rest of the world! How the fascist war-makers must laugh at our moral lectures directed against them! And how low must our moral authority be falling among the peace-seeking peoples of the world, who know that America, among all nations, is the only one with the power to throw the scale one way or the other without having to resort to any warlike measures.

With such contradiction between our expressed ideals of concerted action for peace, and our practical isolationism which is service to the fascist war-makers, the colossal naval expenditures proposed only create further confusion. Still worse, the fight for and against the naval bill is such as to perpetuate that confusion, taking attention away from the fundamental questions of foreign policy making for peace or war.

Reflecting and perpetuating this contradiction is the spectacle of many Congressional progressives, who are the best fighters for Roosevelt's domestic program, deserting the President on his proposals for a positive peace policy, thus throwing the decisive influence in foreign policy over to the reactionary side.

The only way out of this swamp is to organize the masses who favor concerted action for peace, arm them with a sharp and clear understanding of the issue, bring them to expression as aggressively and as clearly as the minority of convinced isolationists whose influence they must overcome, and show the Congressmen that it is just as practical politics, and maybe more so, to demand the execution of the President's Chicago speech as to oppose it. Wipe out the contradictions in American foreign policy, wipe out the contradictions between the line-up on foreign and domestic policy, implement the Kellogg Pact and the high ideals expressed by Roosevelt and Hull, accept the latest proposal of Litvinov—this is the road toward keeping

America out of war by keeping war out of the world. And this is the way, therefore, to render obviously unnecessary any enormous expansion of the war expenditures that burden the people.

New Masses, March 29, 1938.

VII

A Long-Term Policy

THE editors of the *New Republic*, together with some Socialist Party spokesmen, have recently defended their isolationist advocacy by speculating (in print) that the Communist Party will itself soon abandon its energetic support of a policy of concerted action. The utter unsoundness of that speculation is of a single piece with their whole isolationist position. The policy of concerted action for peace is not a short-time or emergency policy merely; it is valid for a whole period, and for all circumstances of that period, whether in the fight to prevent war or the fight to end a war already under way. The immediate practical aspects of such a policy may change from time to time, as some forces swing over from one side to the other, and as war is broadened or narrowed, but the essence of the policy is valid so long as war is the main danger to the world.

In saying this, of course, there is no intention to deny the *emergency* phase of the fight for peace today. These are truly critical days, when millions of lives hang in the balance, and when the balance may be turned one way or the other, accordingly as the United States turns decisively toward isolation or toward international co-operation for peace. The time is short for the masses of the United States to come to a conclusion—if they really desire to exercise their full potentialities for world peace. Time is the essence of the problem, and haste is needed as never before in history.

It is necessary, however, to dissolve once and for all the fatally mistaken notion that international co-operation for peace is a make-shift policy, hurriedly concocted for an emer-

gency, which must at a moment's notice win full support of all its potential adherents or be dropped as a failure.

At this moment, the dangerous implications of such a short-sighted view are seen in the opinion, expressed by many shallow publicists, that the latest moves of the Chamberlain government at London, which take Britain another step away from concerted action for peace, and which strengthen the war-makers, become a signal of the bankruptcy of the policy of co-operation.

It is unfortunate that the short-sighted view seems to determine the practical course of the Washington administration, however much President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull may reiterate their sound and correct ideas in general terms. The administration had opened the door for the repeal or fundamental revision of the disastrous "Neutrality Act," when it consented to the House Foreign Relations Committee opening hearings on the various bills directed to that end. But it suddenly caused the cancellation of the hearings, when it learned of Chamberlain's latest pronouncement. It is clear that for all practical purposes the administration is conditioning all its moves upon the leadership of England. The theory of "parallel action," which is at variance with the theory of international co-operation, is the theory that the United States must under no circumstances take the lead. It is a cowardly and dangerous theory, which is paralyzing American action at the most crucial moment, and doing incalculable damage to the world.

American policy at this moment is thus subordinated, in the most humiliating form, to dictation from Downing Street, London. And one of the ironic jokes of history is this, that precisely those who are most pleased by this are the men who have been wailing loudest against the policy of concerted action, on the grounds that it would subordinate us to British interests! This paradox reveals that the isolationists do not fear taking policy from London so long as the reactionary

Chamberlain determines the policy, but they refuse to have agreement with London only if the Labor Party determines the policy.

That may be completely consistent for Hearst and Coughlin, for whom the British Labor Party is only another web of Stalin's "red network." But Norman Thomas, Frederick Libby and Oswald Garrison Villard swallow the identical conclusion with equal equanimity. They are no more disturbed by their alliance with Chamberlain abroad, than they are by their hook-up with the most reactionary circles at home.

Norman Thomas, especially, stands in an ambiguous position, for which he had offered the public not a word of explanation. He is National Chairman of the Socialist Party, affiliated with the Labor and Socialist International; his brother Socialists all over the world are fully committed to the policy of concerted action for peace, both as national parties and collectively through the Executive Committee of their International. But Thomas and his party in America fight for Chamberlain's line and against the line of the Labor Party, co-members with Thomas in the International. Thomas fights against the line of Blum, Socialist Premier of France, and against the line of the French Confederation of Labor, and for the line of the Right-wing Radicals who keep Blum's government paralyzed in relation to Spain. Thomas fights against the line of Negrin, Socialist Premier of Spain, and supports those elements who are trying to overthrow Negrin and his government. Thomas is in full and complete contradiction to the policy of every European Socialist Party and of the whole organized labor movement of Europe. But he remains in the same International with them, and offers not a single word of explanation to America. He fights against their official position—but in America he attributes this position only to the Communists and says he is against it because it is a "Russian"

policy. *He never explains that he is fighting against the position upon which the world Socialist and Communist movements are agreed.* He never explains that his policy is not only isolation for the United States government, but also isolation for United States Socialists from their brothers in other lands. If he would frankly withdraw from the Labor and Socialist International, this would at least remove some of the worst hypocrisy, even if it would leave him in error as deeply as before.

Thomas may reply that his brothers abroad carry out their professed policy of international co-operation very poorly or even not at all. That is an entirely different issue. To the extent that they do execute their declared policy they are working for international unity and for peace, and the problem is to secure the execution of an established policy; but the more Thomas carries out his policy, the more is international unity disrupted and the cause of peace damaged, and the problem with Thomas is therefore to change his policy.

Roosevelt and Hull must be sharply criticized for allowing the reactionary maneuvers of Chamberlain to determine American policy. We must call upon them to have the courage of their own convictions. If Chamberlain, in control of British policy, does not agree with them, all the more reason for implementing their declared convictions together with those powers which do agree, without delay. The United States, which is in the most advantageous position of any nation, must assume the leadership, the responsibility which we inherit from our privileged position.

It is precisely against American leadership in the struggle for peace that the isolationists fight frenziedly, hysterically. Whenever this idea is broached, they immediately begin to tell us that the Americans are such nincompoops, so constitutionally inferior, such utter incompetents, that we cannot engage in

a leading role in international affairs without being cheated out of our pants. They picture Uncle Sam as the country bumpkin who went to town once in 1917, bought a gold brick, and now must be kept strictly at home on the farm in order to keep him from giving the old homestead away to the first sharper he meets.

Of course, this caricature of Uncle Sam is tempered by the assurance that if our brains are mush, at least our hearts are pure gold. If Europe has a monopoly upon intelligence, then America, they assure us, has a monopoly on virtue. But to keep our virtue, we must remain strictly at home behind our garden walls. We may continue to help the war-makers, but at all costs we must not help their victims or we are irretrievably lost. Such is the isolationist estimate of American character and intelligence.

If there was any truth in this gross caricature, then it might occur to even the most empty-headed of such a moron nation that perhaps we are predestined to fall victims to the devilish clever men of other lands, isolation or no. In such a case, the quicker we get some of those brains on our side the better, if we are really convinced we have no brains of our own.

As for me, speaking as an American whose line can be traced back to 1680 in Virginia, and speaking also for the latest naturalized citizen, I would like to denounce this whole picture as a vile slander upon our people. It may be accurate for some of the degenerate sons and daughters of our "sixty families," who furnish most of the money for isolationist propaganda, but it has not the remotest resemblance to the American workers and farmers, and those middle classes who have not been corrupted by monopoly capital. Americans do not claim any monopoly upon virtue, and we hotly resent any idea that we are excluded from our share of intelligence. We can take care of ourselves, and hold up our end, anywhere and every-

where, provided we learn how to take care of our own reactionaries—and muddleheads—right here in America itself.

America must step forward. Litvinov, for the Soviet Union, after waiting long for an initiative from elsewhere, called for an international conference. If Roosevelt and Hull, for reasons of "practical politics"—that reason which produces so many impractical results—or reasons of prestige, cannot directly respond to that initiative, then let them take the initiative themselves. And if we want something practical to result, let the United States clear its own record a bit to win more international respect, by canceling the infamous "Neutrality Act," and adopting the O'Connell Peace Act, on the basis of which real co-operation is possible.

There are still some people who argue: Concerted action was possible several years ago, as a practical measure, but now with so many great powers out of the League and others showing their contempt for it, this has become a utopian project. That is the same thing as saying that concerted action for peace is practical so long as there is no immediate danger of war. When war approaches as a serious prospect, they say, concerted action becomes impractical. That is of a piece with the logic which assures us a certain remedy is very good so long as we are not sick, but as soon as we fall ill, it is dangerous to take it. It is precisely now, when every action or inaction is fraught with many dangers, that the peace-seeking peoples of the world must find the way to act together or face the consequence of going down together in a chaos of fascism and war.

To the degree that war spreads, to that degree does the policy of concerted action among the peace-seeking peoples become all the more important and necessary. This is a long-time policy, which must direct the fight for peace over a protracted period. It is the only road for the prevention of war, and it is the only road for the ending of war already begun.

Concerted action must begin at home, by the concerted voice and action of all our fighters for peace. President Roosevelt has indicated the correct policy in his speeches, but he still lacks the courage or the support necessary to put it into effect. Let us see that he does not fail for want of support.

New Masses, April 5, 1938.

VIII

Questions and Answers *

Q. Is it not possible to agree with you thoroughly on the aim of collective security, and yet to have strong doubts as to whether collective security will achieve that aim?

A. Yes, undoubtedly, and the great mass of supporters for concerted action have but recently passed through those doubts, and many more are only now in process of overcoming their doubts. Precisely that fact is what makes the national debate now going on of such supreme importance. Most people who hold to isolationist views are not conscious that these views lead to surrender to fascism; most of them are not conscious, also, that the active agents of fascism in America are the most zealous ideologists of isolationism. When we expose these roots and consequences of isolationism, we are by no means imputing a desire to help fascism or promote war to all those who are influenced by these ideas.

Q. Granted that effective concerted action would gain the results hoped for, is it not possible to doubt the possibility of securing such concerted action?

A. Yes, it is always possible to doubt, and the right to do so (at least in secret) is a right which even a fascist regime could not fully deprive one of. But such doubt, persisted in to the point of paralyzing action, on the part of enough people, could itself become the factor defeating the realizable program. Since concerted action is the only way proposed by anyone for maintaining world peace, the only question involved, in the

* When the preceding articles originally appeared in the *New Masses*, readers were invited to submit questions regarding the points raised. From these questions the author culled the following and wrote the answers given below.

final analysis, is whether it is worth while to fight for world peace with all the forces that can be united, whatever they may be. The isolationists frankly abandon the goal of maintaining peace, they accept the war as inevitable; they only hold out the illusory hope that, if we do not fight for peace, we may be allowed to stay out of the world war—at least for a short time!

Q. Assuming that the fascist powers are restrained, and do not answer their quarantine by general war as a last desperate measure, would this not refute the Marxian prediction that capitalism in its death agonies is impelled to more and more desperate acts of self-preservation?

A. No, successful curbing of the fascist war-makers would in no sense be a refutation of any conclusion of Marxism; on the contrary, it would be a supreme illustration of the truths of Marxism. Such a struggle, especially clearly if successful, would finally expose monopoly capital in every land, and all the reactionary forces under its leadership, as the force making for fascism and war, for the destruction of all civilization, for the betrayal of each nation from within to promote its own selfish interests, and would pose the necessity of socialism, the central point of Marxian thought, with full sharpness and clarity before the great masses of every land, especially of the industrialized countries. And precisely this, the taking control of their own destinies by the masses of the people, led by the industrial working class, is the conclusion and crowning point of Marxism; what better example could be given of this than successfully to bring the fascists to a halt?

Q. Assuming that war between Japan and the United States arises out of the situation in China, as illustrated by the Panay *incident, would the Communists support the Roosevelt administration in such a war?*

A. All of our proposals are directed toward creating such a relation of forces as to prevent war and to rectify wrongs

without resort to war. If in spite of all our efforts to this end, war between Japan and the United States arises out of the present world situation, it is our firm conviction that the cause of progress and democracy everywhere would demand the defeat of Japan. We would support the American government in such a war to the extent that its policies and methods contributed toward the national independence of China, and the protection of democracy and progressive policies at home and abroad. We reject the slogan of defeating "our own government" as the main orientation in the present world situation, in which the American government is clearly not aggressive nor moving to subject other peoples.

Q. Does "collective security" or concerted action include military sanctions?

A. Not necessarily, and we are not proposing military sanctions. Such military sanctions as might prove necessary could be undertaken by the nations most directly involved, without the United States, but with American moral and economic support.

Q. Is advocacy of the Ludlow Amendment inconsistent with concerted action for peace and democracy?

A. Yes it is inconsistent, but doubtless there are many people who still find it possible to combine these two positions.

Q. Are you in sympathy with the effort to stir up hostility to Japan as a result of the Panay *incident?*

A. I think it was absolutely correct for all progressives to use the *Panay* incident to arouse the American people to the criminal and bandit policy of Japan in China, to crystallize American sentiment against Japan, and to try thereby to cut off Japan from the enormous help she is receiving from the United States in murdering millions of people and crushing an independent friendly nation. I am only sorry we Communists did not make effective enough use of the incident for this purpose.

Q. Are you primarily interested in the welfare of the people of the United States or the welfare of the proletariat of the world?

A. Starting from my primary interest in the welfare of the workers and farmers of the United States, I have learned that this cannot be advanced by policies based upon *exclusively* national considerations, but must always be adjusted to the needs of international co-operation. Any departure from this viewpoint will always and inevitably lead to enthroning the most reactionary forces in power within the nation. All apparent conflicts between the interests of the American toilers and the toilers of other lands are only illusions, created by the reactionaries in order to break down international solidarity for their own reactionary purposes. The Communist Party always finds the common interests of the peoples as the determining factor in every major problem and situation.

Q. Do you agree that the President's Chicago speech was motivated by vague moral humanitarian ideas, having nothing fundamentally in common with your realistic Communist (class struggle) ideas on the subject of fascist aggression?

A. I realize that the President shares none of our understanding of the class struggle, nor of our objectives of the future society, but that does not change our opinion that the full execution of his Chicago speech by the United States government is in the interests of progress, and therefore in the last analysis of the future of socialist society.

New Masses, March 22 and 29, 1938.

IX

Two Letters *

To the New Masses:

Since the correspondence given below, the *New Republic* has gone over openly to the Chamberlain line (March 30 issue) by advocating rapprochement with Hitler without political conditions. This is a logical follow-up of the letter to the *American Mercury*.

Earl Browder.

March 4, 1938

Dear Mr. Browder:

It seems to me that you were very unfair in your reference to me in the *New Masses* of March 8. You say "Thus Trotskyites boldly collaborate in the fascist *American Mercury*, and Bruce Bliven writes them 'explanatory' letters."

I have written just one letter to the *American Mercury*. They accused me of being a Communist, and I replied defending myself from that charge. Your insinuation that this is an act of friendship on my part toward the *American Mercury* is either an extraordinary piece of muddlement, or something worse. What would you have had me do? Permit their long attack upon me, in an article, to go unchallenged?

Sincerely,
Bruce Bliven.

March 8, 1938

Dear Mr. Bliven:

Upon returning to the city I find your letter of March 4. First of all I must apologize for having spoken of your letter

* The following correspondence refers to the statement made by the author on p. 34 of this book.

to the *American Mercury* in the same sentence with the reference to the Trotskyist collaboration with that organ. This inclusion of the two matters in that single sentence was wrong because it could be misinterpreted that I was trying to directly connect you with the Trotskyites. Accept my apologies for this mistake.

I must, however, say that the reference to your letter, if separated from its direct context with reference to the Trotskyites, was in order and must stand. The very fact that you considered it necessary to defend yourself from a charge of the fascist *American Mercury* that you are a Communist and to defend yourself in an explanatory letter to that publication gave some justification for the *Mercury's* exultant comments that their charges against you had borne good fruit, inasmuch as it had brought you into the international anti-Communist pact. I did not insinuate that this was an act of friendship upon your part to the *American Mercury.* I was pointing out that it was a step toward capitulation to the *American Mercury.* The *American Mercury* itself so greeted it, and you did not consider this important enough to make a public statement on.

In conclusion, let me assure you that I have not the slightest desire to develop unnecessary differences. In the past period, before the sharpening of the issues of isolation, I had considered the *New Republic* representative of some of the healthier elements in the non-Communist Left circles. It has been a great disappointment to me to see the *New Republic,* under your leadership, break down so completely on this issue.

Sincerely,

EARL BROWDER.

New Masses, April 5, 1938.

X

"Should the United States Government Join in Concerted Action Against the Fascist States?" *

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Libby, and Friends: My task tonight is to sustain the position that the United States, in the interests of preserving world peace, should take part in concerted international action to restrain the fascist war-making governments.

It is in the interest of clarity that Mr. Libby is the spokesman for the opposite point of view, because he is the most consistent spokesman for the neutrality bloc which promises to keep America out of war through isolationist policies.

Before we examine any proposals directed toward world peace, perhaps we should first answer the question—is world peace worth preserving? The most prominent spokesmen for the so-called neutrality policy have generally agreed that it is not worth the effort. They have abandoned the very idea of world peace. They have substituted the acceptance of an inevitable general world war. Some of them even consider that such a war will be of benefit to the rest of the world. They agree only that America should at all costs keep out of the war and, therefore, faced with a world in danger of war, keep out of world affairs.

Allow me to speak against all of these ideas. It is possible to halt those forces which are dragging the world toward war. It is worthwhile doing this because, however bad may be the peace precariously maintained at present, it is better than war. To

* Speech in the affirmative, in the debate with Frederick J. Libby, Executive Secretary, National Council for Prevention of War at Madison Square Garden, New York.

attempt to isolate America from world affairs, at a moment when her moral and economic influence could be decisive in the interests of peace, means in reality to surrender the world to the war-makers, to make America their partner, and finally, to bring that war to the whole American people.

Is it possible to identify the enemies of world peace? Is it possible to direct our main effort toward restraining them? Mr. Libby and his friends say no. They say all governments are equally guilty of threatening world peace. They say any attempt to identify the war-makers means an arbitrary and unreal classification of governments as "angels" and "devils." They place in the criminals' dock the government of the United States and President Roosevelt alongside the Nazi regime and Hitler. In the present state of the world it seems rather childish to find it necessary to argue against such a point of view. The whole world knows who it is that sends invading armies across borders and against other nations. The whole world knows who is conducting aggressive war on other people's territory and who threatens further war. It is not at all necessary to look for "angels" and "devils," but only to ask who aggressively cross their own borders. They are the governments of the self-styled anti-Communist alliance, the governments headed by Hitler, Mussolini and the Mikado. If it is desirable to restrain the war-makers, then it is possible to identify them without the slightest doubt. It is further possible to deal with them as a group, because they are associated with common aims.

Perhaps, however, the war-makers are so powerful and so well placed that the peoples and governments who seek peace cannot hope to restrain them, and must of necessity retreat or surrender? But most obviously this is not true. The war-making governments control—by terror and suppression—not more than 10 per cent of the population of the world. Their control of economic resources is certainly no more favorable to them. Mr. Libby assumes that it is even more favorable to the

peace-seeking peoples by identifying the war-makers as the "have-not" nations. The peace-seeking peoples occupy the most strategic positions geographically, which makes the isolation of the war-makers a relatively simple technical problem. Finally, the peace-seekers have an enormous moral advantage. They express the desire of all peoples, even those controlled by the fascist governments, for peace. This moral advantage can consolidate not only the overwhelming majority of the peace-seeking nations behind a positive peace policy, but it is also capable of arousing the oppressed millions under the fascist governments, once the easy victories of the dictators come to an end. The peace-seeking peoples have an overwhelming advantage in numbers and resources, in geographical and moral positions. They are superior in every factor which can influence the course of world affairs—except the will to use their advantage. This missing factor I wish to help produce. Mr. Libby is against producing the missing factor. This is the essential difference between us.

What is the secret of the success of the fascists in their drive toward world domination? It is an open secret which the whole world knows. It is the division among the peace-seekers. The war-making powers know what they want and move toward it concertedly and ruthlessly. They take one bite at a time out of the world they wish to devour entirely. Manchuria was taken by the Japanese militarists, while the rest of the world did nothing except utter moral condemnation. Ethiopia was invaded by Mussolini—and the gestures of restraint were carefully calculated not to be effective, and quickly abandoned when they inconvenienced Mussolini. The demilitarized Rhineland was occupied and fortified by the Nazis—and again there was only the reading of a moral lecture. Spain is invaded by Hitler and Mussolini and subjected to the most ferocious slaughter—and the peace-seeking nations respond by treating the Spanish republic as the criminal to be quarantined. Austria

is invaded and wiped out as an independent nation—and Mr. Libby, with his associates of the neutrality bloc, hail the event as "a step toward stability." It is clear that the fascists succeed in dragging the world into war because the peace forces of the Western democracies are divided; they have no general plan of action; many of them desert one another; they act with the greatest consideration toward the fascist war-makers and the greatest lack of consideration toward their victims. The majority of peace-seeking nations, the bourgeois-democratic countries, have allowed themselves to become confused and paralyzed by the threat of fascist aggression from without and by the demagogic trickery of powerful reactionary minorities within.

It is clear that the whole problem is that of defeating the reactionary minorities within, and achieving some degree of a common front among the peace-seeking nations. The trump card of my opponent and his associates of the neutrality bloc, upon which they gamble all their chips, is, in the last analysis, the confusion and disunity among the peace-seeking peoples and their assumption that this condition is not remediable. They assume that there is no leadership capable of bringing any unity among the peace-seekers. They point to the fact that when the Soviet Union, through the Litvinov proposals, gives the initiative to this end, the Western democracies are silent, refusing to allow the land of socialism to lead the peace forces. They point to the fact that when the Mexican republic, through President Cárdenas, offers a similar initiative, the great democracies are too proud to take a lead from one of the smaller nations. They point to the fact that Britain, assumed to be among the democracies, has turned her back on the goal of organized peace and, under the leadership of Chamberlain, is making her own terms with the war-makers at the expense of the rest of the world. They point to the fact that the French republic, itself saved from a fascist insurrection only by the

hasty erection of the *Front Populaire*, is paralyzed by fear and drags at the apron-strings of Chamberlain. Where, they triumphantly ask, is there a leadership which can bring any stability into this swamp of indecision and cowardice?

There is not the slightest desire on my part to evade or underestimate any of these difficulties. It is only by facing them fully and frankly that we can find the way to overcome them. But we declare that it is possible to overcome all difficulties, it is possible to organize the world peace-front. This is possible, however, only on condition that we set ourselves this task, that we refuse to surrender either to our own difficulties or to the threats of the war-makers. We declare that the alternative is to surrender the world to universal catastrophe.

From where can the leadership come that has the possibility of organizing the peace forces of the world? We propose that it shall come from the United States. The United States has the strongest selfish interest in peace, without which it cannot maintain world commerce so necessary to it under the present system. We say that the United States is in the privileged position of being able to assume world leadership for peace without serious danger to itself. The United States holds in its hands the key to world peace. The question before us is, shall we hesitate, fumble and drop this key through fear or incapacity? If we do, that will be the most unprofitable and most shameful page in American history.

Let us, before we proceed further, examine in more detail this privileged position in which the United States finds itself. I am glad to note that on this point Mr. Libby agrees with me. He has written several times recently that the United States is entirely immune from foreign invasion. In February, 1938 he wrote: "We should give due consideration to the fact which is vouched for by leading military and naval experts, that our country cannot be invaded.... We cannot have a war, therefore, unless we seek it abroad." I will leave it to Mr. Libby to

establish this point in detail. I accept it as substantially correct with two important qualifications: first, that it is true only for the immediate period and the present world-relation of forces, but will be changed substantially if the fascist governments succeed in subjugating Western Europe and China; and second, it is true only for continental United States and does not apply to the Philippines, Hawaii and the Pacific Islands, or Alaska. I must, however, draw opposite conclusions from those of Mr. Libby from these facts. He says that, since we are safe, we should risk nothing for the peace of the world. I say, precisely because we are safe for the present we, above all, must take the leadership in preserving the peace of the world, which is also to guarantee our own peace for the future.

A further feature of America's privileged position is our unexampled economic resources. Not only has the United States almost half of the world's accumulated wealth and productive resources, but we are also most nearly, among all nations, economically self-sufficient. Considering the greater mobility of American wealth and production, we can easily say that the economic weight of our country in world affairs is equal to, or greater than, that of all other countries combined.

In short, we are not exaggerating when we say that the United States occupies a position as nearly ideal as one could hope to find in this imperfect world, for leadership in organizing world peace.

Power without responsibility is soon dissipated. We propose that our country should accept the responsibility that goes with power. We propose American leadership to save the world from war.

Of course, we are keenly conscious that anyone who advocates world peace in this practical way will be charged with being in favor, in reality, of a preventive war against the fascist powers. I feel certain that Mr. Libby will repeat this charge tonight as he has been making it heretofore at every

opportunity. When President Roosevelt, in his famous Chicago speech advocating quarantine of the aggressors, gave a brief indication of such a positive peace policy as I am defending, the neutrality advocates joined in the shout that this was a policy of dragging America into war. But what do we actually propose? We propose to make peace profitable and war unprofitable. We do not propose war or any steps that would lead toward war. We do not propose any entangling alliances, nor any limitation upon American freedom of decision and action. We do not even propose that America shall accept leadership from any other country. We do not propose to abandon any of the great American traditions in foreign policy. We do not propose any revolutionary innovations.

The sum and substance of a positive peace policy, according to our conception, is to withdraw America's economic and moral influence from direct or indirect support of the war-making governments, and to cast this influence instead on the side of peace and the peace-seeking nations. We propose that the United States should distinguish between those nations which violate their obligations to us to refrain from warlike aggression against their neighbors, obligations which they voluntarily assumed by solemn treaty, and those governments which on the contrary observe these treaty obligations. We propose that the United States shall cut off all economic intercourse with those governments which violate the Kellogg pact outlawing war, and shall maintain and extend our economic relations with the governments which observe their treaty obligations and especially with those who are victims of aggression. We propose that the United States shall follow a policy designed to vindicate the simple laws of morals and justice, which ought to govern the relations of private individuals, as the rules paramount of the intercourse of nations.

The whole substance of the policy which I defend here is

embodied in the provisions of the O'Connell Peace Bill, which is now before Congress.

What would be the result of the application of this policy? It would mean the immediate lifting of the embargo against republican Spain—a shameful embargo which was an unfriendly act against a democratic government, a violation of our own treaty obligations and against the interests of America. In its place, it would lay an embargo against all commercial and economic relations with Germany, Italy and Japan, as well as against Franco's armies of invasion in Spain. It would mean that American scrap iron, cotton, chemicals and machinery would stop going to Japan to assist the enslavement of the Chinese people. It would mean stopping the hundreds of thousands of aerial bombs now being shipped from America to Hitler. It would mean the complete divorce of American economy from its present service to the war-making governments.

Mr. Libby is already on record that this does not create the danger that the fascist governments will counter such an embargo by making war against the United States. But many of his friends in the neutrality bloc do not agree with him on this. In particular, Dr. Charles E. Beard, speaking for an important part of the neutrality bloc, has written in the *New Republic* directly against the policy I am defending, that if the United States ever undertook such a task, then in all likelihood the fascist powers in a "war frenzy," "a spirit of world power or downfall," "would strike back" and make war against the United States. Against this argument of the Beard section of the neutrality bloc I place the evidence of Mr. Libby himself that "our country cannot be invaded, we cannot have a war unless we seek it abroad." Unfortunately the unity of the neutrality bloc is an unprincipled one, and Mr. Libby and Dr. Beard simply agree to disagree on this point, without in any way disturbing their harmonious co-operation in keeping America isolated at all costs. This difference of opinion between

them is merely a division of labor. Mr. Libby is to round up for neutrality all those who will agree on the basis of the argument of safety, while Dr. Beard shall round up those who can be scared into neutrality by the threat of immediate invasion.

Would this policy, which is embodied in the O'Connell Peace Bill, bring the United States into entangling alliances or limit our freedom of decision and action? Not in the slightest. We propose that the United States should assume no special obligations toward any government except the obligation of impartially applying this policy to all and sundry. Once the policy is established, of course, it is assumed that the United States would welcome the adherence to the same sort of policy by as many governments as would wish to do so or which could be persuaded to do so. We know in advance that some important powers will immediately follow the lead of the United States, among them certainly the Soviet Union and Mexico. We can assume that the people of France would greet such action by the United States with the deepest joy, because it would liberate their People's Front government from its humiliating bondage to the pro-fascist, tory government of England. We can reasonably expect that, with such a profound change in the relation of world forces, the British Labor Party would shake off its present paralysis of fear, and actively rally the peace-loving majority of the English people behind it. We can be absolutely certain that, as a result of such a policy, the peoples of Spain and China would be enormously strengthened in their heroic struggle against the fascist invaders and would quickly administer for the first time some decisive military blows against the invaders and thus realize in the most practical fashion the popular slogan, "Take the profits out of war." Through all of these consequences of the adoption of the O'Connell Peace Bill the United States would find its privileged position of exemption from the immediate threat of war not weakened, but, on the contrary, greatly strengthened. In facing every ques-

tion it would in no wise be hampered in freedom of decision or action by any entangling alliances or special obligations.

Is there any danger that with such a policy the United States would become a catspaw for the sinister ambitions of other powers? Would there be any danger of falling under the domination of "perfidious Albion," or raking British chestnuts out of the fire? This is the great bogeyman of one section of Mr. Libby's neutrality bloc. His associate, Mr. Quincy Howe, has written a whole book on the subject, the conclusion of which is that the British tories are so damnably clever and Americans such constitutional simpletons that the only way we can avoid being the catspaw of British imperialism is by complete withdrawal from world affairs. But, strangely enough, neither Mr. Howe nor any other Anglophobe has the slightest difficulty continuing in the closest comradeship with Mr. Libby when he praises the Chamberlain tory government for capitulation to Mussolini, says this is the only path to peace, and openly advises the United States to model its own foreign policy on the example of Chamberlain. Strangely enough, they fear British imperialism only if the Labor Party should come to power and swing England to the support of a world-peace front headed by the United States. But they are quite complacent toward a British imperialism expressed in Chamberlain's alliance with fascism and even want us to follow England along that shameful road.

Would the policy that we propose require us to break with the great American traditions in foreign policy? No, on the contrary, precisely this policy, and only this, would give us a continuation of that greatest of all American traditions in this field that was established by Thomas Jefferson as Secretary of State under Washington's administration. At that time the young and weak American republic, occupying a position far removed from our present overwhelming strength, was not afraid, in the interests of peace and democracy, to boldly chal-

lenge the reactionary aggressors and align itself on the side of their victim. When in 1793 France, a new republic such as Spain today, was attacked and blockaded, Thomas Jefferson wrote:

> The idea seems to gain credit that the naval powers combining against France will prohibit supplies, even of provisions, to that country.... I should hope that Congress ... would instantly exclude from our ports all the manufactures, produce, vessels, and subjects of the nations committing this aggression, during the continuation of the aggression, and till full satisfaction is made for it.

About the same time Jefferson wrote to Morris, Minister to France, the following:

> We received information that a National Assembly had met, with full power to transact the affairs of the nation, and soon afterwards the minister of France here presented an application for three million livres, to be laid out in provisions to be sent to France.... We had no hesitation to comply with the application ... and we shall ... omit no opportunity of convincing that nation how cordially we wish to serve them ... placing our commerce with that nation and its dependencies on the freest and most encouraging footing possible.

What America needs today, what the world needs, is a foreign policy based upon these lines of Thomas Jefferson. The general line of such a policy has been proposed by President Roosevelt. It is contained in the O'Connell Bill. The whole country must be rallied to support it, and to demand its energetic application in life.

Does the policy which I defend call for a revolutionary change of the principles of twentieth-century American foreign policy? No, on the contrary, the basic principle of all American post-war foreign policy is embodied in the Kellogg-Briand pact, initiated by the United States and signed by almost every government in the world, which pledged its signers to abstain from war as an instrument of policy. We propose nothing

further than the recognition of all violations of this treaty, the exclusion of the violators from economic intercourse with us, and the provision of economic aid to the victims of such violation.

Let us pass on to the consideration of some of the typical and standard arguments of the isolationist school of thought, which Mr. Libby shares and which must be answered here. One of the most used is the argument that America must not take sides against the war-makers, because, while they may be formally violating treaties and world peace, in reality this is only because they have been unjustly dealt with; that they are the "proletariat among nations," that they represent the "have-not" peoples, whose demands must be vindicated against the rich nations, against the "haves." We cannot join with Mr. Libby in assuming that, even if this were true, America should assist or condone the resort to war to remedy the supposed grievances. But we challenge the assumption of Mr. Libby's facile classification into "haves" and "have-nots." If we are to assist the "have-nots" against the "haves," then surely we must help Ethiopia take possession of Italy and not the other way around; we must help Manchuria to some of the Japanese wealth; we must help the Chinese people make Japanese economy serve their great needs and not the other way around. The wildest stretch of even Mr. Libby's imagination cannot paint Czechoslovakia as a "have" nation in contrast with Nazi Germany which threatens its destruction. It is true that the bandit governments, when they have gobbled up the small and most "have-not" countries, will move toward the object of their greater ambitions, the wealthy countries, and, above all, the United States, but that is only the music of the future. I have yet to hear Mr. Libby or any of his associates propose that that half of the world's wealth which is held by less than 10 per cent of the world's population of the United States should be divided up among the other nations of the world in order to bring about

that equality among the peoples which would wipe out this classification of "haves" and "have-nots." Perhaps Mr. Libby does believe that America's wealth should be so distributed. If so, he should tell us tonight. If not, he should drop the meaningless classification of "haves" and "have-nots" which is only a shame-faced justification for fascist aggression. It is an interesting historical sidelight on this argument that it was Japanese imperialism which taught this slogan to Mr. Libby and his friends, which first justified military aggression against weaker peoples on the grounds that the aggressor was hard up, a "proletarian among the nations," and needed the booty. Every common criminal is equally justified in his crime.

But Mr. Libby, in common with all his associates, strenuously objects to the introduction of moral standards into the relations between nations. They say it is unrealistic and dangerous. They say this is the unreal classification of governments into "angels" and "devils." They cry, we all are sinners together, therefore let none pass moral judgment upon his neighbor. Since Mr. Libby is personally a Quaker and a pacifist and also, if he draws the logical conclusions from his position, a philosophical anarchist who would desire the immediate dissolution of all governments, there is a certain logic and consistency in his position, but for the great majority of workaday Americans, who are not Quakers, are not pacifists and not anarchists, this summary dismissal of moral standards from the field of foreign relations is unacceptable. We are too keenly conscious of the results of such an attitude in the destruction of the standards of morals and justice between man and man, of the disintegration of all social ties, that must flow from the adoption of amorality as our guiding principle in international relations. The advocates of neutrality and isolation argue for the acceptance of international anarchy as the permanent condition of world affairs. We declare that the time has come when the continuation of civilization itself, in America as everywhere,

depends upon world organization to enforce a minimum moral standard among nations.

The world organization of peace, like the organization of civil society itself, cannot begin by passing judgment upon all past crimes that arose from the prevailing anarchy, but it must begin by establishing certain standards which everyone must now live up to or find the world organized against them. These first primitive conditions for a world organization of peace have been established in the Kellogg pact. Any government which sends armed forces outside its own borders into the territory of another government without its consent, or which blockades the ports of another government, or furnishes arms and munitions to insurrectionists against another government, with or without a declaration of war, is guilty of violation of the Kellogg pact solemnly subscribed to by all the governments of the world, is guilty of aggression, is guilty of a crime against world peace, a crime which threatens the very existence of civilization. The foundations for a certain basic world order which will prevent war by making it unprofitable, has thus been laid. Mr. Libby and his friends would have us abandon this foundation. We propose American leadership in further building upon this foundation.

Those who would have us abandon moral standards between nations are not only helping to maintain world anarchy and contributing to the eventual triumph abroad of the fascist powers, but they are also leading us toward surrender to fascism within our own country. Our most ardent neutrality advocates, like Mr. Libby, draw the logical conclusion from their position when they denounce the boycott of Japanese goods as a warlike measure and demand that the boycott movement shall be disbanded in the interests of peace. They draw the logical conclusion when they demand that we shall stop all criticism of the crimes of Hitler and Mussolini. They draw the

logical conclusion when they attack the supporters of Spain and China among the American people as the real war-makers and the real danger to the peace of America. But the further logical conclusion of this demand for moral neutrality in face of the crimes of the fascist war-makers is the break-down of all social and political morality within America itself. When Mr. Libby proclaims there is no democracy worth helping in other lands, he is thereby undermining and discrediting our own democracy in America and weakening it before its domestic enemies. When moral standards are abandoned in foreign relations, they will quickly decay and disappear in domestic relations, as has happened in the domestic life of Germany, Italy and Japan. Our neutrality advocates have cynically abandoned moral standards. We appeal for the strengthening of moral standards.

Some of Mr. Libby's associates, whose collaboration he has gladly welcomed in joining the so-called Committee to Keep America Out of War, try to ridicule us, the members of the Communist Party, for our championship of international morality. Particularly, Norman Thomas, Jay Lovestone, Bertram Wolfe, accuse us that thereby we have abandoned the teachings of Marx and Lenin, have abandoned our revolutionary Communist principles. They, on their part, claim to uphold the teachings of Marx and Lenin by ridiculing moral standards between nations as a guiding principle. By this, however, they only expose their own hostility to the teachings of Marx and Lenin, their own renegacy from the revolutionary principles of Socialism. Against all such arguments allow me to quote to you somewhat extensively from the Inaugural Address to the First International written by Karl Marx in 1864. Dealing with the czarist conquest of the Caucasus, the suppression of the Polish uprising, and the Russo-Turkish war, current events of the day, Marx said:

The shameless approval, mock sympathy, or idiotic indifference, with which the upper classes of Europe have witnessed the mountain fortress of the Caucasus falling a prey to, and heroic Poland being assassinated by, Russia, the immense and unresisted encroachments of that barbarous power, whose head is at St. Petersburg, and whose hands are in every cabinet of Europe, have taught the working classes the duty to master for themselves the mysteries of international politics; to watch the diplomatic acts of their respective governments; to counteract them, if necessary, by all means in their power; when unable to prevent, to combine in simultaneous denunciations, and *to vindicate the simple laws of morals and justice, which ought to govern the relations of private individuals, as the rules paramount of the intercourse of nations.* The fight for such a foreign policy forms part of the general struggle for the emancipation of the working classes.

Here, in the very words of Marx, we have formulated the precise description of the policy we urge upon the United States today. We propose nothing else than that the United States shall establish as the guiding principle of its foreign policy "to vindicate the simple laws of morals and justice, which ought to govern the relations of private individuals, as the rules paramount of the intercourse of nations." Marx himself tells us that the fight for such a foreign policy forms part of that general struggle for the emancipation of the working class. This is just as profoundly true today as it was when Marx first wrote it in 1864.

Mr. Libby and most of his associates deny there is any relationship between alignments on foreign policy and those on domestic issues. But we cannot accept this shallow separation of the two. We admit quite readily, of course, the continued existence of great confusion among the masses and among some of their leaders, but we believe this confusion is being rapidly dispelled. Just as in the domestic political issues of our country, so also on foreign policy, we find the growth of two new political camps which cut across old party lines, one the camp of progress and democracy, the other the camp of reaction and fascism.

The camp of reaction and fascism in our domestic life is the main force behind the policy of neutrality and isolation. The camp of progress and democracy is the main force behind the policy of concerted action under American leadership to restrain the fascist war-making governments. When Mr. Libby called upon his followers recently to rejoice, because, as he expressed it, "Hoover resumes leadership in international affairs," and joyously reported Hoover's return from a visit with Hitler and his complete rejection of the theory of concerted efforts against aggressor states, we have a right and a duty to ask what this means in the domestic life of our country. When Mr. Libby advises us to listen to Boake Carter for our radio interpretation of the news, when he asks us to agree with William Randolph Hearst's editorials on foreign affairs, when he asks us to get inspiration from Father Coughlin's radio sermons—all in the interest of peace—we have the right and the duty to ask him what kind of company is he getting us into, what will be the effect of this kind of leadership on the daily life of our country? It is a fact that all the most sinister powers in America, monopoly capital, Wall Street, the sixty families, and all their most loyal agents, are fighting on the side represented by my opponent this evening and against any action to curb the bandit fascist governments.

On the other hand we have the following significant alignment of forces on the side which I am defending tonight:

Organized labor, both of the American Federation of Labor and the Committee for Industrial Organization, overwhelmingly support President Roosevelt's Chicago call for quarantining the aggressor, as well as the O'Connell Peace Bill. Most of the articulate intellectual circles, university professors, students, writers, are, in great majority, supporting the O'Connell Bill for concerted action against the aggressors. Church organizations, outside of the Catholic hierarchy, are at least three-fourths on the same side. The political forces

aligned with the New Deal are almost unanimously in its favor. The great student-strike movement on April 27 marched at least 90 per cent under the banner of lifting the embargo against Spain and the adoption of the O'Connell Peace Bill. In a recent gathering of peace advocates called in Washington, with the participation of Mr. Libby himself, with the objective of turning attention away from concerted action and toward abstract problems of world economics, a revolt among the guests against the program of the leadership of that conference disclosed the majority on the side of concerted action to restrain the fascist war-makers. During the past six months the progressive majority of the American people have decisively broken away from the false neutrality policy. They are emphatically supplementing their progressive and democratic platform in domestic affairs with a progressive and democratic foreign policy, the policy of quarantining the aggressors. At the same time all the forces of reaction are gathering for a desperate last-stand fight to maintain the old, bankrupt neutrality-policy.

There are, of course, still some examples of confusion and a crossing of lines of the two main camps on the question of foreign relations. Outstanding of these is the alignment of LaFollette and a few Congressional progressives with the neutrality block. These people are the constitutionally unbranded, unpredictable and, even in domestic policies, not consistently progressive; at the present moment they are engaged in some fantastic speculations on a possible political realignment which would bring them into one camp with the Republican Party of Hoover and Hamilton. Henry L. Stimson and a few other outstanding figures of former days in the reactionary camp come out for concerted action against the war-makers, but these exceptions only emphasize the rule.

The fascist bloc of war-making powers operates under the flag of the anti-Communist alliance. The neutrality bloc within

America agrees with the slogan of Hitler that the menace of Communism and of the Communists is what is endangering the peace of the world. Because the American people are so overwhelmingly against fascism, our own domestic anti-Communist alliance says it is against fascism and Communism, but in all their arguments and in their practical activities we find the menace of fascism figures very little, if at all, and their main concern is to fight Communism. And who are the Communists? The anti-Communist alliance certainly is not primarily concerned with my small party. Their definition of Communism is so broad that it includes the New Deal and President Roosevelt himself, especially it includes the policy of quarantining the war-making governments. The anti-Communist slogan in America has exactly the same significance as Hitler's use of this same slogan to establish his bloody dictatorship over the German people. It has exactly the same significance as the same cry against the Spanish republic. It is preparation for the fascist destruction of democracy and the republic also in America.

The organization for which Mr. Libby speaks has declared officially that it "does not co-operate with Communists or fascists." I do not question that this prohibition against co-operation with fascists is applied to the open, self-labeled fascist groups in America. But these are not the most dangerous expressions of fascism in our country. Hitler also spoke against fascism when he was fighting for power; he operated under the slogan of socialism; he called his party the *National Socialist Party.* We must not be surprised that American fascism is taking on the banners of democracy and even of labor. Who can forget our famous "Liberty League," even though the du Ponts would like to have us forget it. And with these, the most dangerous, fascists who sail under the flag of liberty like Hitler did under the flag of Socialism, are precisely the most powerful and welcome supporters of Mr. Libby's viewpoint.

Must I mention any names other than those of Hamilton Fish, Father Coughlin and William Randolph Hearst to substantiate this charge?

Mr. Libby's organization does not co-operate with Communists, they say. Surely they do not co-operate with the Communist Party, for on the question of the road to peace we stand in opposite camps; but when they can find anyone who calls himself Communist, but who at the same time supports neutrality and isolation then we find Mr. Libby and his organization are quite ready for the closest collaboration. Mr. Libby is a member of the Committee to Keep America Out of War. This body was launched at a meeting in the Hippodrome, New York, on March 9, in which Mr. Libby sat on the platform. Mr. Oswald Garrison Villard, the meeting's chairman, praised one of the speakers, Mr. Bertram D. Wolfe, as "the tireless organizer" of the whole affair. Mr. Wolfe calls himself a Communist. He made a speech at that meeting, in which he declared that in case of war between the United States and Japan he proposed to work for the defeat of the United States. Not Mr. Libby nor any of his associates on that platform repudiated that slogan at the meeting or since, and they continue to work together in close alliance. Mr. Libby may reply that Mr. Wolfe is not really a Communist at all. That is absolutely true, and we would like to emphasize this to the whole world. Mr. Wolfe has for years, however, maintained close connections with the Bukharin group in the Soviet Union, the leaders of which a few weeks ago were executed for applying in the most practical way in that country the slogan that Mr. Wolfe put forth for America, the defeat of our own country in a possible war with Japan. Is it too much to ask Mr. Libby if he agrees to collaborate with people who call themselves Communists only provided they stand for the defeat of the United States in case of a war with Japan? Or does he agree to collaborate with that kind of self-styled Communist only be-

cause he knows they are not Communists at all but sail under a false flag? And may we ask what Mr. Libby thinks about this use of the slogan for the defeat of our government when faced with a fascist power, when this slogan is put forth from the same platform on which he sits, under the auspices of an organization of which he is a leading member? We, on our part, are prepared to answer this question with full sharpness. We consider Mr. Bertram D. Wolfe no better than an undercover agent for Japanese imperialism. We declare that if, in spite of all our efforts for peace, Mr. Libby's policy should prevail and therefore war should in fact occur between Japan and the United States, then we consider that the interest of world progress, of peace, of democracy, of the independence of China's four-hundred millions, of the future of America and of the Japanese people itself, all joined to demand the defeat of Japan's militarist government in such a war, and we would make that defeat a major guiding consideration of our whole policy under present world relationships.

The greatest danger to the peace of the whole world is the retreat of the peace-seeking nations before the fascist offensive. The fascist menace has grown on its easy victories. If this course is not stopped, the fascist war aggression will soon be on American soil itself. This is apparent to anyone with the slightest knowledge of the course of world affairs since 1931. Yet, the neutrality bloc and not least its spokesman, Mr. Libby, find their only hope of world peace in continued retreats and surrenders to the fascist powers.

Within the past few weeks Mr. Libby's official organ, a publication called *Peace Action*, often under Mr. Libby's signature, has expressed an attitude toward current events which is identical with Chamberlain in London and leads in the same direction of coming to agreement with fascism on its own terms. With regard to Austria they expressed "relief to have this inevitable union over with" and concluded that "it will

be a step towards stability." They are satisfied that "The future of Spain is apparently in process of solution . . . in the discussions between Chamberlain and Mussolini." They are hopeful that Czechoslovakia "will now sever itself from Russia and develop its ties with Germany." They declare that "Danzig belongs to Germany and will return to Germany." They express the hope that Germany and Poland, while settling the corridor problem, will also decide without disagreement the fate of Memel and, presumably, also of Lithuania. They say "these changes . . . should have been made years ago." They urge the United States to follow in the Far East the same disgraceful course Chamberlain has followed in the Mediterranean, toward Hitler, and toward Spain. They speak apologetically of Franco's bombardments of Barcelona, against which they are unable to arouse any indignation whatever, not even as much as the Pope who blesses Franco. In judging the effects of Franco's recent military successes in Spain they cannot see in this any new menace to European peace; on the contrary, they conclude, "Europe is much nearer peace today than it was a month ago." These are quotations from the current issues of *Peace Action*, edited by Mr. Libby. In not one single issue of that paper, not one single article, not a paragraph, not a sentence, can be found a word in condemnation of Hitler, Mussolini or the Mikado, as the violators of world peace. And all of this, which clearly represents the path of surrender to the war-makers and to fascism, is presented as "peace action." Such is the conclusion to which neutrality will bring all its adherents if they do not break once and for all with that bankrupt policy.

Those for whom I speak, and on this I am sure I speak the mind of the majority of the American people, see in every victory of the fascist war-makers a darker gathering of clouds of war over the world, including America. We declare Chamberlain's criminal sell-out has stimulated every reactionary and

war-making force. We see in the conquest of Austria a knife in the back of the Czechoslovakian republic, the last oasis of democracy in central Europe, which can stand only by unity with France and the Soviet Union. We find Spain's contribution to world peace in the heroic republican forces that brought Franco's foreign armies to a halt. We find the hope of the Far East in China's magnificent national unity and military successes against the Japanese. In short, we see every one of the questions from the exactly opposite viewpoint of Hitler, Mussolini and the Mikado, and therefore from the exactly opposite viewpoint of my opponent of this evening and of his associates. They see peace only in the victory of the fascist dictators; we see peace only in the defeat and destruction of fascism. That is why my opponent wants the United States to continue helping the fascist dictators; that is why we demand that the United States shall take the lead in concerted efforts to halt them.

Would a courageous initiative by the United States against the war-makers receive enough support in the world to defeat them? Yes, we would have overwhelming support if we displayed a firm policy. It is certain the Soviet Union would wholeheartedly support such a policy. We would end the hesitations of the French government and its dependence upon Britain. We would encourage British democracy to throw over the cynical Chamberlain. America alone could change the whole course of world affairs by our moral and economic influence. We could ensure the victory of the Spanish republic, which was almost at the point of victory several times while American influence was thrown the other way. We could ensure the victory of China which, without our help, is already bringing Japan to the verge of collapse. The defeat of the war-makers in these two areas would shatter the myth of their inevitable victory, would release the democratic aspirations of their own people, who would quickly abolish their

defeated dictators. And we could do all that without the slightest danger of involving the United States in war. Failure to do this will create for us the danger of war. The United States enjoyed for a time a privileged position. This makes it our inescapable responsibility to use this position to help organize the peace of a world in which no other land is so fortunately situated. If we delay too long, our immunity will quickly disappear in a world made victim to fascist aggression, conquest and destruction. By acting now against the war-makers of the world, we *can* keep America out of war.

FIRST REBUTTAL

I want first of all to express my warmest appreciation to Mr. Libby for having so ably proved my case for me. I am sure that his speech convinced more people than mine did of the absolute necessity of breaking once and for all from a neutrality attitude which can lead us to such consequences as he proposed to us here tonight. Not all advocates and spokesmen of this policy are fair enough to us to be as frank as Mr. Libby, and I think we should thank him for his frankness.

Mr. Libby has told us tonight quite openly that he proposes, as the way to peace, to make the fascist nations prosperous. If we make them prosperous enough, they will stop threatening us with war. I asked Mr. Libby if he was prepared for that purpose of dividing American wealth among the fascist nations. He did not answer that directly, but I think we can see that this is the logical conclusion which must be drawn from his remarks.

Mr. Libby expressed agreement with us on some points. But it is a strange agreement. I said neutrality is murder. Mr. Libby says he agrees with me that neutrality is not enough.

Starting from a premise that moral standards must not be applied to fascist nations, Mr. Libby suddenly begins to wax

moral—we find he has not lost his morality entirely. We are glad to see that he does not entirely disregard moral standards, but it seems a little strange that moral standards come in and are allowed to operate only on condition that they operate in favor of Hitler and Mussolini; that he adheres to morals only when they operate in favor of the war-makers; that an embargo against the war-makers is wrong because it will starve the helpless women and children in Germany, Italy and Japan, while an embargo against loyalist Spain is all right. I think it is not an accident, it is not at all an accident, that in the forty-five minute presentation of Mr. Libby's road to peace he did not have one single word of condemnation for the bombardment of Barcelona.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Libby relies mainly, for bringing you around to his point of view, upon telling you about the terrible, terrible things that are going to happen when "the boys come home." He wants to frighten us by telling us what our enemies are planning against us, the terrible things that Hitler is going to plan against us if we cross him. He forgets one thing: the fascists abroad and at home will make their plans, but when it comes to executing these plans we are going to have something to say about the question.

Mr. Libby is disturbed because I don't propose that the United States go to war; and as most of his argument is directed toward the horror of war, he must conclude in spite of everything that I do propose war, so he says "an embargo against the war-makers is a war measure." But, my dear Mr. Libby—we propose an embargo against the war-makers; you propose an embargo against both the war-makers and their victims; therefore, you propose war against both of them, war against friend and enemy alike. You say embargo is an act of war, but the whole purpose of the Neutrality Act is designed to place the embargo against both war-makers and

victims—if the embargo is war, you propose twice as much war as we propose, war against the whole world.

Mr. Libby assured us that if we dare take action against the fascist dictators, this will only consolidate the people of these countries behind their dictatorships, and he draws a picture following the American declaration of embargo of the women of Italy rushing with their wedding rings to Mussolini. But what is the truth of this? These dictators live upon the cheap victories presented to them by policies such as Mr. Libby wants us to follow. When those cheap victories stop, the dictators will fall. One good stiff licking is enough to finish Hitler, because so far from having the support of the German people, Hitler can exist only so long as he can create the appearance of invincible power that even forces the British lion to crawl at his feet. The moment that illusion is wiped away, at that moment the house-of-cards of fascism will begin to tumble.

The reason why Mussolini grew strong in the period of so-called sanctions is not because the sanctions were applied, but because the sanctions were sabotaged; that made Mussolini strong.

Well, I have one minute. Let me use that for a statement regarding the name of Mr. Libby's organization. It is the "Council for Prevention of War." I think after hearing Mr. Libby giving the policy of that organization here tonight we should propose in the interest of honest advertising they change their name to the "Council for the Granting of Full Power to the War-makers in the Rest of the World."

FINAL REBUTTAL

My opponent has tried to put me in a position of being absurd, by stating that I stand for the "status quo" and he wants to remedy the ills of the world. When you examine this

a little more deeply, this argument becomes an apology for the fascist war-makers. We do not defend the "status quo" but we say, so long as there exist war-making governments in the world that are changing the status quo by means of invasion of other people and destruction of other nations, talk about peaceful change is so much poppycock.

It is uniform among the advocates of the neutrality-bloc policy to ascribe the most serious danger to world peace as coming from the Soviet government whereas the danger from fascism is only the danger of resisting fascism. Yet, at the same time that those people are trying to scare us by saying that the Soviet Union is bringing about war, they come with their clever provocation to demand why the Soviet Union hasn't gone to war already. I will tell you why the Soviet Union has not gone to war—because it stands for exactly the same kind of policy we are proposing for the United States, not war but the organization of peace. It is the privilege of everyone to disagree with the inner organization of the Soviet Union if they don't like socialism, if they prefer capitalism, but it is not the privilege of anyone who wants to stand as a peace advocate to try to slander the Soviet Union by saying that it is not a peace advocate, and at the same time try to provoke it to go to war. The Soviet Union remains, as it has been through the whole post-war period, the most reliable, the most stalwart, the most powerful bulwark of peace and progress for the peoples of the entire world.

We say the time has come when the world must choose between war and destruction or organized peace. The United States has the peculiar opportunity of taking the lead and organizing the peace of the world. We cannot, however, protect ourselves and protect the world from the threatening catastrophe if we follow the course that has been defended this evening by Mr. Libby. The time is short. If we disregard too long

our opportunity, it will quickly disappear and the fascist aggression will increase. By acting now against the war-makers of the world, we can keep America out of war by keeping war out of the world!

Debate at Madison Square Garden, May 4, 1938.

XI

Lessons of the Moscow Trials

The treason trials just finished in Moscow, in which Bukharin, Rykov, Yagoda, Rakovsky and their seventeen co-defendants revealed at last the full scope and extent of the international fascist conspiracy to overthrow the Soviet government, are not to be considered the domestic affair of the land of socialism. The murderous conspiracy there revealed, throws a bright light on current events all over the world; in Spain, 30,000 new Hitler storm troopers join Franco's new offensive, with a new army from Mussolini, and hundreds of airplanes and heavy guns, while simultaneously the "Fifth Column" of fascism, behind the Loyalist lines, composed mainly of Trotskyists, tries to raise panic and demoralization; in Austria, Hitler consummates the obliteration of an independent nation, prepared by treachery and conspiracy from within; the Chinese people develop their heroic and history-making resistance to the Japanese invasion, but only at the price of systematic weeding-out and shooting of the generals and other officials in the pay of the Japanese secret service. In the United States itself, the smallest tip of the tail of the espionage rats was caught, with the arrest of a half dozen Nazi agents engaged in military espionage against our own land, while the Japanese espionage still operates with relative freedom. There is no part of the world whose fate was not involved in the net-work of treason, murder and war-provocation revealed in the Moscow trials.

Our *Daily Worker* has printed verbatim all the most important evidence of the trials, with the last words of the defendants, as well as the indictment, the prosecutor's summing-up and the sentence of the Supreme Court. Within a few

weeks the complete transcript of the Trial proceedings will be available to all in book form for more complete study. But we already have the complete picture with all its essential details. We can all give our considered judgment on the trials, and draw the lessons for our own particular problems in our part of the world.

After the first two Moscow treason trials, in August, 1936 and January, 1937, the capitalist press and the papers of the Second International joined in a cry of "frame-up." They tried to convince the world that even the confessions of the accused were faked, and that the conspiracy was on the side of the Soviet government itself and not of the accused, who were suddenly pictured as "saints of the revolution," "Old Bolsheviks" and so on, who for their revolutionary virtues must now be defended by the capitalist press and the Second International. The Soviet government, and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, had betrayed the pure doctrines of Marx and Lenin, they said, which are now being jointly defended by Trotsky, the capitalist press and the Labor and Socialist International Executive Committee. Even our own New York *Herald-Tribune* came out as the defender of Leninism! And of course, William Randolph Hearst, Eugene Lyons and Max Eastman were in the front lines!

Now with the last trial over, the evidence before us, the Court's verdict given and executed, now even the most hardened newspaper defenders of the traitors have been forced to drop the cry of frame-up, have been forced to admit the overwhelming proof of the guilt of the accused. The entire world is convinced that there actually was such a conspiracy, that it was accurately identified, that the accused were justly convicted. Even the most bitter-end opponents of the Soviet Union, including those without scruples or conscience, realize the old game is up, that it is useless any longer to repeat the old "frame-up"

cry. The facts of the case are now established, once and for all, for the whole world.

Today the journalistic and political defenders of Trotsky and his executed collaborators take up a new line. Admitting the facts, they now cry out that either way, true or false as the charges may be, the Soviet Union is equally discredited and disgraced before the world. If it had been a "frame-up," as they originally charged, then the Soviet government was the arch-criminal of all history; now that the old cry is completely discredited, the facts established, the Soviet Union is to be made responsible for the appearance of such extreme criminals in its ranks. Ha, ha, they cry, look at what enormous criminality is produced by the Soviet system, and in its very highest ranks too! That is enough by itself to prove the Soviet system is unsound, because it produces rotten fruits! It is enough, they shout, to admit the existence of such treason in high places, to automatically condemn the whole Soviet government! Some of the most brazen of these journalistic harlots even write imaginative stories involving all Soviet officials as traitors, and demand complete distrust toward everything connected with the Soviet Union.

How shamefully un-American, how anti-American, this position is, is clear to everyone with any knowledge of American history. If such an argument could hold against the Soviet Union, then American democracy would have been condemned from its beginnings. If Stalin, Molotov, Kalinin, must be made responsible for Trotsky, Bukharin, Tukhachevsky, as these defenders of wrecking demand, then George Washington must be made responsible for Benedict Arnold and Thomas Jefferson responsible for Aaron Burr. It needs only to draw this parallel, to completely expose the falsity of the argument, at least to anyone whose Americanism is deeper than his anti-Soviet prejudices!

It will help all Americans to understand the historic signifi-

cance of the trials, if we review our own history more at length, in the light of recent events.

The establishment of the United States as an independent nation was a vanguard event in the development of the bourgeois-democratic revolution in the whole world; it was the opening of a new stage in a world revolution. In this respect there is a valuable analogy between the position of the United States in world affairs at the close of the eighteenth and opening of the nineteenth centuries, and the position of the Soviet Union today. And both countries, in the period of revolution, suffered from treason and wrecking from within, in low and high places. We can safely say, making allowance for enormous differences in historical epoch and social relations, that America suffered much more than has the Soviet Union from treason, relatively speaking. Let us recall some of the details.

First, there is Benedict Arnold, whose name for Americans takes its place alongside that of Judas as synonymous with the utmost depths of treachery. Arnold was a close intimate of George Washington; he was described as "brilliant" and "gallant." He was ordered to be tried by court-martial, by act of Congress, but was let off with a reprimand. Washington defended Arnold, disapproved of the court-martial, and afterward invited Arnold to resume a post of honor in the Army and, on his request, gave him command of the principal military post in the country, West Point. One and a half years before receiving this appointment, Arnold was already in treasonable connections with the British. Within a few weeks after receiving this command, Arnold plotted to surrender West Point to the British at a date and hour when Washington, Lafayette and others were to arrive at West Point. The plot failed only because the go-between, Major Andre, was caught returning through the lines with the documents of the plot—Trotsky and his friends a century and a half later had learned to burn their documents! Arnold escaped, and openly joined the British, re-

ceived a reward of thirty thousand dollars and brigadier's commission.

A mayor of New York was involved in a conspiracy to assassinate Washington, a plot which included a member of Washington's bodyguard, who was executed.

A widespread plot arose inside the Revolutionary Army similar to that headed by Tukhachevsky in the Soviet Union. Headed by Thomas Conway, and called in history the "Conway Cabal," this plot included General Horatio Gates, Thomas Mifflin, Charles Lee and others; at one time they controlled the Continental Congress; their scheme centered on the assassination of Washington and his closest comrades, just as the Trotsky-Bukharin plot centered on assassination of Stalin and his closest co-workers.

In 1797, Congress impeached Senator Blount, of Tennessee, for treasonable conspiracy with Britain to involve the United States in war with Spain. As in so many other treasonable adventures, the traitor found protection in the Senate of which he was a member.

With the advent of Jefferson and the Republican-Democratic party to power in 1800, the Federalist Party quickly passed over to wholesale treason, which lasted for fifteen years. Hamilton was the leading figure in the treason, for the first period but, due to rivalry with Aaron Burr for leadership, later split the Federalists and opposed Burr when he took over leadership of the treasonable forces. The conspiracies involved such well-known and formerly powerful figures as Gouverneur Morris, George Cabot, Higginson, Fisher Ames, Pinckney, Rutledge, Ross, White, Tracy, Pickering, Cutler, Dayton, Hillhouse, Griswold—men who had controlled the destiny of the country during Washington's and John Adams' administrations.

How did these "eminent" Americans fight against Jefferson? Allow me to quote from an outstanding authority, Claude G. Bowers, who cannot be suspected of bias in favor of the argu-

ment I am making. When the Napoleonic counter-revolution was straining relations with the United States, in the difficulties which led up to the Louisiana Purchase, Bowers describes the beginning of the general treachery as follows:

> Instantly the strategy of Federalism was clear—to force a war if possible, to furnish the West with a pretext for separation if necessary, and to make impossible by every human means the success of any peaceful negotiations Jefferson might plan.

Describing the situation in the government circles, Bowers says:

> All the while the Federalist leaders in House and Senate were secretly planning treason—but that did not enter into the gossip then, nor for a long time afterward.

But while, as in the Soviet Union, the conspirators kept themselves hid for a long time, they were during the whole period, in Bowers' words, "up to their armpits in a conspiracy of secession."

During this period these gentlemen opened up their systematic connection with foreign powers. At one point Bowers describes this as follows:

> They had not scrupled to approach Merry, the British Minister, with a proposal that Britain reject the boundary treaty on the ground, plainly expressed, that this would help in the steps already commenced toward a separation from the Union. . . . They naturally look to Great Britain for support and assistance whenever the occasion shall arrive.

Already in 1803, the conspirators were planning an armed *coup-d'état*. Bowers records that "If a resort to arms were necessary it was hoped that Hamilton would agree to become commander-in-chief."

Pickering, writing to Gouverneur Morris ten years after, in 1814, formulated the conspiratorial policy as follows:

For many years past I have said: "Let the ship run aground! The shock will throw the present pilots overboard; and then competent navigators will get her once more afloat, and conduct her safely to port."

Senator Pickering of Massachusetts continued regular correspondence, giving confidential information and advice, with the British government through many years up to and including the period of the war with England of 1812.

Double-dealing of the Federalists, on the model followed by the "Bloc of Rights and Trotskyists" in the Soviet Union, was followed especially in the period of the war with England. While in Congress they voted for the war, they privately assured the British Minister that this was only to create conditions for overthrowing the Republicans, and prepare a peace advantageous to England.

The New England state governments, controlled by the Federalists, openly sabotaged the military and financial measures of the U. S. government, and secretly trafficked with the enemy. British confidential reports of the period said:

Two-thirds of the army in Canada are at this moment eating beef provided by American contractors, drawn principally from the states of Vermont and New York.

Were it not for these supplies, the British forces in Canada would soon be suffering from famine, or their government be subjected to enormous expense for their maintenance.

It was wholesale treason in the American army that opened up the national capital, Washington, to the British Army, resulting in the sacking of the city, the burning of most public buildings, including the White House, from which President Madison escaped only a few hours before it was occupied by the British soldiers.

Aaron Burr furnished the classical American analogy to Trotsky in the Soviet Union. While he was vice-president of

the United States, under Jefferson, he opened his treasonable relations with foreign powers. Although the Supreme Court of the U. S., under Chief Justice Marshall, later acquitted him when he was brought to trial, his guilt was apparent not only to Americans but to the whole world.

British Minister Merry, writing to Lord Harrowly, on August 6, 1804, reported:

> I have just received an offer from Mr. Burr, the actual Vice-President of the United States, to lend his assistance to his Majesty's Government in any manner in which they may think fit to employ him, particularly in endeavoring to effect a separation of the western part of the U. S. from that which lies between the Atlantic and the mountains.

Burr's conspiracy also extended to arrangements with the Spanish government, in developing which he suffered the same embarrassments that the Trotskyites complained of when confronted with the rival demands of their dual masters, Japan and England.

In Burr's scheme a central role was played by General James Wilkinson, formerly Chief-of-Staff of the U. S. Army and then Governor of Louisiana Territory. Wilkinson went enthusiastically into the plot, but later when he saw the dangers of defeat, like many Trotskyites in the Soviet Union, he turned states' evidence and helped the government to unearth and smash the conspiracy. Later on, however, like the oppositionists in the Soviet Union in past years, he used his immunity to again enter treasonable conspiracies against his country.

Burr's plot, like that in the Soviet Union, was definitely designed to destroy the new system that had been established by the Revolution, and return to the old discredited and overthrown regime. As reported by Minister Merry, in a report to Mulgrave in London:

He (Burr) observed that when once Louisiana and the western country became independent, the Eastern states will separate themselves immediately from the Southern, and that thus the immense power which is now risen up with so much rapidity in the western hemisphere will, by such a division, be rendered at once unformidable.

Burr planned not only an armed coup to separate the Western territory, but also an uprising in Washington. The scheme was to bring armed men into Washington, one by one, and at a given signal seize the President and Vice-President (Burr was by that time out of office himself), capture the arsenal and naval base, and throw the central government into confusion.

In the Burr conspiracy was involved many of the highest Army officers, Judges of the U. S. Courts, Senators and Congressmen, federal and state officials of all sorts, and the whole leadership of the Federalist Party at one time or another.

Like the plots of the Rights and Trotskyites in the Soviet Union, the Burr conspiracy had no roots in the population. The historian, Adams, described Burr's circles in the following words:

Burr's conspiracy, like that of Pickering and Griswold, had no deep roots in society, but was mostly confined to a circle of well-born, well-bred, and well-educated individuals.

As in Trotsky's conspiracy, the broadest circle of its agents and allies worked under cover, and when it was exposed they were loud in the defense of Burr and their denunciation of Jefferson. At the same time they washed their own hands of any responsibility for the affair, as Norman Thomas does today. But we can, as Comrade Foster has already pointed out in his foreword to a pamphlet on "The Meaning of the Soviet Trials," answer the apologists of Trotsky with the identical words of Thomas Jefferson, who wrote on April 20, 1807:

The Federalists, too, give all their aid, making Burr's cause their own, mortified only that he did not separate the Union, or overturn the government, and proving, that had he had a little dawn of success, they would have joined him to introduce his object, their favorite monarchy, as they would any other enemy, foreign or domestic, who could rid them of this hateful republic for any other government in exchange.

Jefferson also gave the perfect answer to those who argued then, as Norman Thomas argues now, that the charges are too fantastic to be believed. As Comrade Foster has already quoted, Jefferson said:

Burr's enterprise is the most extraordinary since the days of Don Quixote. It is so extravagant that those who know his understanding would not believe it if the proofs admitted doubt.

Like Burr, Trotsky relies mainly upon the extravagance of his plots to obtain non-belief in their exposure.

Jefferson answered the argument, now so popular among Trotskyite apologists, that the trials weakened and discredited the new republic. He said:

On the whole, this squall, by showing with what ease our government suppresses movements which in other countries requires armies, has greatly increased its strength by increasing the public confidence in it.

It took the United States government thirty-eight years before it finally suppressed the treasonable circles that had arisen in the first days of the revolution, and which had occupied high posts in the government established by that revolution. The Soviet Union has dug out and liquidated its treasonable sects in only about half of that time. The United States government, during that thirty-eight years of fight against treason, had to deal with tens of thousands of traitors in a population of three to six millions; the Soviet Union has had to

deal with a few thousand traitors in a population of one hundred eighty millions.

Altogether, the relative showing of treason in the early years of American bourgeois democracy and the early years of Soviet socialist democracy is not unfavorable to the land of socialism. And just as every American democrat must indignantly reject the idea that our traitors were the fruits of our new democratic system, just so must we also reject, for equally valid considerations, the identical argument that the Soviet traitors are the fruits of the socialist system of society, instead of, as the truth is, the fruits of the reactionary and fascist conspiracies against the Soviets.

Treason in the United States was not finished, however, even with the War of 1812 and the burning of the White House. When our country was face to face with the vital issue of slavery and the preservation of the Union, in the years leading up to 1860, we had traitors in control of the White House, of both houses of Congress, and of the Supreme Court, as well as in the Army. These traitors in high places deliberately prepared the dismemberment of their country, dispersed its armed forces, sent its supplies to the conspiring insurrectionists, surrendered its fortresses to the enemy. During the Civil War that ensued, the government began operations with a Chief-of-Staff who worked in agreement with the enemy. A confederate spy attended the meetings of the General Staff, and was subsequently arrested. When, at the conclusion of the war, Lincoln was assassinated, the deed was clearly protected and organized from within the government circles, as was the assassination of Kirov in the Soviet Union in 1934. And if Jefferson had his Burr, let us not forget that Roosevelt has his Garner.

If there are Americans still sufficiently naïve to think that the days of treason ended with the Civil War, let them ponder the words of William E. Dodd recently resigned as Ambassador to Berlin, who publicly declared:

There is no doubt that the Nazi Government has paid spies in America and that many of these are ranking American officials.

It is clear that the arrest of a few lower-class Nazi spies during the past few weeks is still far away from the centers of fascist espionage and treason that infest the upper circles of American society. The open incitations to assassination of President Roosevelt that have been published in the New York *Herald-Tribune*, the New York *Sun*, and the McClure Syndicate confidential dispatches, are only a little whiff of the devil's brew of treason that boils in Wall Street circles. The recent column of the well-known Republican commentator, Mark Sullivan, in which he compares President Roosevelt with a skunk, and proposes to remove a skunk from the national premises by writing polite letters to him, was but a cowardly echo of this assassination propaganda in high places. Treason is afoot in America today. Let the Moscow trials arouse the American people to more alertness toward it!

Since the Trotskyites and their collaborators, the Bukharin-Lovestone groups in all countries, entered into the organized intelligence services of Hitler and Japan and became their agents, they have worked overtime to put "revolutionary" slogans to work for the fascists, trying to confuse and disrupt the revolutionary working-class movement and divert it to irresponsible actions planned by the fascists.

Thus in 1933 the Trotskyites in the United States concretely raised the slogan of "turn the imperialist war into civil war," used by Lenin in the World War of 1914-1918, and demanded that this slogan shall govern the attitude of American workers in the event of war between Japan and the United States. When the Communist Party definitely repudiated this scandalous misuse of Lenin's famous slogan, and pointed out that this was encouragement to Japan's aggressions in China, and a promise to aid Japan if the United States should in any way

come to the help of China, the Trotskyites accused us of "abandoning Leninism." When the Bloc of Rights and Trotskyists had adopted a full program of dismemberment of the Soviet Union, the destruction of socialism and the return to capitalism, they launched their new phase of activities under the slogan that Stalin had betrayed the revolution. At every turn, in every country and locality, in every workers' organization, the Trotskyites and Lovestoneites-Bukharinites have reduced this scheme of treachery to a science; for every dirty job the reactionaries and fascists want done among the workers, these vermin will find a high-sounding "revolutionary" theory and slogan.

This was the technique by which the Trotskyites recruited many of their dupes in the Soviet Union; and this is also the means they rely upon especially in the United States. This was how they got their hold on Norman Thomas, with his political collapse inevitably ensuing. The case of Norman Thomas and Trotskyism is worthy of a more detailed examination in the light of the last trials.

Thomas was not always the pitiful figure that he now presents on the political scene, with no one so poor as to do him honor, not even the Trotskyites whom he serves. We are apt to forget that only a few years ago Thomas was a powerful political force in the country, far beyond even the measure of almost a million votes which he gathered in 1932. The story of his seduction by Trotskyism is the story of his political bankruptcy, so that today his chief significance is that of defender of self-confessed traitors, murderers and spies.

It was the rise of Hitler to power in Germany, which marked the new phase of activity of the spies and wreckers and their collection into a new general bloc or alliance in the Soviet Union, that also started Norman Thomas moving in the same direction. He was frightened and thrown into a deep panic by the collapse of his German comrades of Social-Democracy; he

began to look for new guidance, a new orientation; lacking any theoretical ability of his own, and stubbornly rejecting any serious united front with the Communist Party, which we systematically urged upon him and his associates for years (even to the extent of offering to make great sacrifices for it), Thomas closed one after the other all doors except that leading to union with the Trotskyites. He has been uniting and splitting with them ever since, and with each move he drops still more of his past political influence and prestige.

On the most crucial issue of the day, the fight for peace, we have the most sharp example of the political corruption of Thomas by the bloc of traitors and spies. Thomas is today one of the most frantic in denunciation of the Communist Party for our line toward concerted action for peace; at the same time he denounces the Communists for "inconsistency" in changing our position over the years. But Thomas has never yet uttered a word of explanation for his own changes, for in 1932 he occupied a position on this question very close to that of the Communists today in many respects; the difficulty between us is this, that as we tried to approach and unite with the broad democratic position Thomas then occupied, Thomas himself abandoned that position and moved over to Trotskyism.

Let me make this point very clear and explicit, by giving you a series of quotations of the position of Norman Thomas in 1932.

In the *New Leader* of February 6, 1932, Thomas wrote the following:

> The disarmament Conference at Geneva opened to the horrible tune of Japanese bombs and guns in Shanghai. Disarmament must succeed if there is to be peace in the world, but disarmament cannot succeed while such cruel imperialism as the Japanese military clique has forced upon the Far East stalks abroad in the world.
>
> If the United States weeks ago had deliberately sought co-operation

in the League of Nations with Russia in economic pressure on Japan, almost certainly the present crisis would have been avoided.

While the United States lost an opportunity that will not come again, whatever hope there is lies in the substitution by the nations of effective economic pressure. This requires co-operation with the nations in the League and with Russia.

After this fundamentally correct statement, which is even more true today, Thomas wrote three weeks later an answer to the Thomas of today. He said:

Certainly I do not agree with Senator Borah that economic embargo means war. Properly handled, it might be the alternative to war. . . . I still think that it would be well to see a frank conference with both the League of Nations and Russia on united moral and economic pressure against an aggressor nation.

It required the Trotskyites and Bukharin-Lovestoneites to convince Thomas that this was wrong, because it was against the interest of the fascist aggressors and would impede their hopes of seizing power in the Soviet Union.

The following week, Thomas wrote again a statement which is entirely correct today, but which Thomas has now abandoned under the influence of Trotsky. He said:

The United States government should have taken the initiative in seeking a world conference to impose on Japan world-wide embargoes on loans and war supplies. If this had been done sooner I think a great victory would have been won for peace. It is still the best method to use against a recalcitrant Japan.

If Norman Thomas had stood firmly by and further developed his correct position of 1932, he would not be the tragic figure he is today, isolated and discredited before the American masses. He would be a powerful figure in the broad democratic movement against war and fascism. But then he would have had to fight against the Trotskyite and Lovestoneite ideas and

groupings, instead of surrendering to them and joining their pro-fascist "anti-Comintern" alliance. Thomas, following the same logic as Trotsky and Bukharin, that springs from lack of faith in the people, and panic before fascism, surrendered his correct position of 1932, capitulated to Hitler, and joined with Trotsky. The Moscow trials have thrown a light upon all such problems, including the political degradation of Norman Thomas.

Over almost two years, we have become so accustomed to the systematic defense of the fascist spies and wreckers by the American newspapers, that we are in danger of tending to take it as a law of nature, a matter of course, something not even to be remarked about. But this is a political phenomenon of the first order, one which shows how deep the influence of the Hitler-Mussolini-Mikado "anti-Comintern" alliance penetrates into American life. It is of the same seriousness and significance as the spectacle of the newspapers in 1936 going overwhelmingly for Landon when the people were going overwhelmingly for Roosevelt. It is a sign of the profound reactionary forces driving toward fascism in our country.

But there are two new points on this question, raised by the last trials. In his testimony, Bukharin told about how he had arranged in advance, through his connections with the Second International leaders, that they should take the lead in mobilizing the press of the capitalist countries in their defense. Evidently Bukharin's friends did an effective job and responded without hesitation to this call.

But in the United States we have our own special example of this technique. It will be recalled that in January, 1936, on the occasion of the Piatakov-Radek trial, a Trotskyist agent by the name of Romm appeared, who had been stationed in Washington for some time as a correspondent of the Soviet press. When Romm confessed to being a liaison agent for connections with Trotsky, a group of his former associates in

Washington, of the American press, came forward with a statement declaring their confidence that he was not a traitor despite his confession. Apparently this was a spontaneous and voluntary help from fellow-craftsmen to a comrade in difficulties. However, we have made our own investigation in this matter, and have learned without the slightest possibility of doubt, that Romm himself had pre-arranged this defense before he left America, knowing beforehand that when he was recalled to Moscow he might be called upon to explain some evidence against him. If Romm had been innocent, why would he have considered it necessary to make such pre-arrangements? And what shall we think of our American newspaper men, who made this public appeal for Romm, without revealing that Romm had asked them, before he left, to be prepared for such an action if the issue arose?

The second special American angle to this question that is new, is the entirely unprecedented and unexplained complete suppression of an item of the trial which, by all newspaper standards, was one of the most sensational items for Americans. If, in a trial of world importance, a well-known American is named as an active agent in the very center of a plot involving the peace of the world and the fate of the world's first socialist society, that would seem to be news, to say the least. Perhaps it would have to be denied, and evidence brought forward to prove that it was not true. But when an American was named by Christian Rakovsky, as the agent who had secured from the British government agreement to Rakovsky's appointment as Ambassador, on the grounds that Rakovsky was closely identified with Trotsky and therefore valuable to the British, this news was completely suppressed by every newspaper and other publication in America, with the exception of the *Daily Worker*, the Midwest *Daily Record* and the San Francisco *People's World*. Not a line, not a word, has been printed to make known to America that a well-known American writer

was so accused in a world-historical trial. Was this item suppressed by the correspondents in Moscow? It is almost unthinkable that this would be so. By what means was this suppression achieved in America? That is one of the most interesting questions of the day, and its answer might reveal much to us of the technique of control of a free press in a capitalist democracy.

This complete suppression of the charge against a widely-known American, this contemptuous refusal to even allow the question to be made known, is one of the most revealing incidents of the trial in its relation to America, and the forces in our country working hand in hand with the fascist agents.

The capitalist newspapers, Norman Thomas, and the Trotskyite-Lovestoneite groups, are working overtime now to propagate the idea that the Soviet Union is an enemy of democracy, that all Communist support of democracy is hypocritical, and that the Moscow trials furnish proof of this. Let us face this issue fundamentally and squarely, and force these gentlemen—if they are not too slippery for us—also to come down to brass tacks. Let us systematically examine their main arguments.

They say the fundamental error, the original sin, of the socialist state was that it originated in a revolutionary overthrow of the old order. We throw back into their faces the well-known fact that all democracies, including the United States of America, also originated in a revolutionary overthrow of the old order. If the Soviet Union is to be condemned on this count, then the U.S.A. is also condemned. We support the origin of the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R.

They say the socialist state violated democracy when it drove out and disfranchised those who took up arms to restore the old order. We throw back in their faces the well-known fact that all democracies, including the U.S.A., did the same thing, and that the U.S.A. drove out a much larger part of its population than did the Soviet Union, with at least equal violence,

and that this was essential to the very establishment of democracy. We support the energetic crushing of the enemies within of the republic of the United States, just as we support that of the Soviet Union, and proclaim that both were services to democracy without which democracy would have been crushed.

They say the land of socialism violates the principles of democracy by its political set-up of a single party. We throw back in their faces that the original conception of the democracy of the United States was that of the single party, the party of all convinced adherents of the new system, that the United States operated on that system for more than twenty years, and that the system of dual parties arose only because a small exploiting class, controlling that Federalist Party, forced Jefferson and the masses of the people to organize a new party to prevent the complete crushing of democracy. Our Constitution was amended to allow for the operation of two parties only after more than a quarter-century of independence. The Soviet Union operated with many parties for years, and they were dispersed only when they took up arms against the Republic. We support the idea of uniting all convinced adherents of democracy into one party at the origin of the U.S., even though it failed, we support the idea of a single democratic front in the U.S.A. today, and we support the successful inclusion of the overwhelming mass of the population behind the single party of socialism in the Soviet Union. In all these instances, these are examples of the struggle to realize democracy, under different conditions, which all go in the same direction.

They say the Soviet Union violated democracy by carrying through collectivization of agriculture over the opposition of a few hundred thousand kulaks, at the cost of a severe struggle and great hardships. We throw back in their faces, that the democracy of the U.S.A. was forced, eighty-six years after its foundation, to carry through an agrarian reform much less

far-reaching but against greater resistance, and only at the cost of four years of Civil War, millions of casualties and twenty years of military rule in almost half of the country afterward. We declare that, for all its costs, the Civil War in the United States was a service to democracy all over the world, that the collectivization in the Soviet Union was a greater and more fundamental service, more successfully carried out with much less cost, and that those who attack the Soviet Union today are by that token repudiating our own American history and revolutionary heritage. Precisely because we are Americans, and value and love our American revolutionary heritage, we are the enthusiastic supporters of the Soviet Union in its tremendous democratic achievements, including collectivization.

They say that the democratic tradition, exemplified by America, is a method of settling political problems without violent struggle, while the Soviet Union shows that its system breeds violence. We throw back in their faces the long history of armed insurrections, conspiracies, assassinations and civil violence, which has been the constant accompaniment of every stage in the development of American democracy, and declare that the Soviet Union, a nation twenty times the size of the U.S. in its formative period, has shown a development a hundred times more peaceful than the early stages of bourgeois democracy anywhere in the world, whether in France, England or in the United States.

Precisely because we love and would protect the achievements of American democracy, we love and protect that higher form of democracy which is being surely and firmly established in the Soviet Union, showing the way to the whole world of the twentieth century, just as the United States was showing the way to the whole world in the eighteenth century.

All the enemies of progress and democracy, all the weak-minded dupes of developing fascism in the United States, have taken up the Trotskyite cries of slander against Joseph Stalin,

the genius who inspires and guides the successful construction of socialism in the Soviet Union, who makes of that land a bulwark of peace for the entire world. All their venomous hatred, the putrid essence of their murderous souls, is spewed out in the American press, trying by all means including the most foul, to smear the name of Stalin before the American people.

As we witness this disgusting spectacle, we remember our American history. We recall how the same forces carried on exactly the same kind of campaign against Thomas Jefferson in our own land, even to the point of organizing mob violence against him. We recall the long campaign of slander and abuse against Tom Paine, which lasted a hundred years after his death. We remember the murderous incitations against Lincoln, which stopped at no slander, however low, and which led up to the assassination of the most loved figure in American history. We cannot ignore that today, we have a campaign against our own American President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, which behind the curtains is equal in virulence to that against Comrade Stalin, and which is more and more breaking into the open also in open incitations to assassination, and which is organized and cultivated by Wall Street circles.

And we declare before the whole world, that even if we had nothing to guide us except this hatred of President Roosevelt by the worst enemies of the people, this alone would be enough to bring us actively to his support, and to declare that any man who wins such hatred from our enemies, thereby wins a certain admiration from us. And with regard to Joseph Stalin, who has shown the way to the peoples of the whole world, as to how our enemies can be decisively defeated, how the eternal crisis and starvation of the capitalist world can be overcome, how a life of growing prosperity, well-being, culture and happiness can be won for the broad millions of the whole population, we declare before the whole world with the deepest pride,

that we have been brought to admire, to love, to respect, and to learn from, the greatest leader of democracy that mankind has ever produced, the greatest helper and guide of the common people of every land, the symbol of the united strength of the toiling masses in victory over their oppressors, none other than the man who is the object of the concentrated hatred of every exploiter in the world, Joseph Stalin.

Every open and concealed enemy of American democracy, is trying to make use of the incitations against the Moscow trials as a weapon, also, to make the American people believe that it is the Communists in America, and not the Trotskyite-Lovestoneite groups and their masters, the fascists, who are guilty of conspiracy and violence against democracy in our own land as in the Soviet Union. With this Red-baiting, they try to split open the progressive and democratic forces, and set them to fighting one another so that the reactionaries may slip back into power, using the tactics in our country which the fascists so successfully used in Austria, to that country's doom.

Allow me to use this occasion to repeat, to again put on the record, the answer of the Communist Party to the effort made in Albany to use this tactic to put through a new law to bar Communists from public office. Allow me to state again, that the Communist Party opposes with all its power, and will help to crush, by all proper and democratic means, any clique, group, circle, faction or party, which conspires or acts to subvert, undermine, weaken or overthrow, any or all institutions of American democracy whereby the majority of the American people have obtained power to determine in any degree their own destiny. Allow me to categorically state, that we stand one hundred per cent, under all circumstances, for the power of the majority of the people to control the destinies of our country. We of the Communist Party will fight with all our power to defeat, offering our lives if necessary, any and every

effort, whether it comes from within or from without, to impose over the American people and nation the will of any selfish minority group or party or clique or conspiracy.

On March 15, I had occasion to express this in a telegram to the Chairman of the New York Senate Judiciary Committee at Albany, which I want to read here. The telegram said:

Today's press carries news of Senator McNaboe's bill which would bar persons believing in overthrow of government by force and violence from holding public office. The McNaboe bill, while it does not apply to the Communist Party which repudiates any theory of overthrow of democracy, nevertheless has given rise to wide misconceptions and may make necessary a public hearing to clarify the situation. The bill as drafted is clearly unconstitutional and can be used against all civil servants and public officials who take a progressive position on any question. For the information of your committee and your fellow legislators let me state that the Communist Party unreservedly supports American democracy and the American constitution and fights for the maintenance and extension of democracy. Irrespective of what may have been said or may have been written to the contrary, the following is a true statement, in brief, of the Communist position:

1. The Communist Party opposes the overthrow of American democracy. On the contrary, it supports American democracy and urges the widest possible common front of supporters of democracy in order to maintain it.

2. The Communist Party does not advocate force and violence. It is not a party of anarchists, terrorists, or conspirators. By no stretch of the imagination does it come under the terms of the criminal anarchy statute or any law patterned after that statute.

3. The Communist Party is an American party and is not subject to any foreign control. The Communist Party is an American party from the ground up. Its policy is based entirely upon American needs and it is absolutely not subject to any decisions except its own conventions and officials elected thereby.

The Communist Party reminds the Committee that undemocratic legislation like the McNaboe measure can only lead the country along the road to Hitlerism. The McNaboe bills start off ostensibly with the Communists but always wind up, as we see in the tragic case of Austria, with the Schuschniggs, the Miklases, the Catholics, Jews and

liberals. You and I and our fellow-Americans in the State legislature certainly do not want such developments here.

(Signed) Earl Browder
General Secretary, CPUSA.

This position, stated by myself on behalf of the Central Committee, was already adopted by formal resolution at our Ninth National Convention, in 1936; it will surely be unanimously endorsed by our coming Tenth National Convention, which will write these principles into our Party Constitution so clearly that even a capitalist newspaper editor cannot distort the question.*

It is interesting to note, that our capitalist newspapers carry on a great campaign to convince the masses that to adopt the Communist program must mean to adopt a line of forceful and violent overthrow of democracy. They refuse to print our repeated official statements to the contrary. Thus, while we are trying with all our power to make all Communists into clear-headed and convinced fighters for democracy, these newspapers are trying, with all the power of their millions of circulation, to destroy and undo our work. They *want* the Communist Party to adopt a conspiratorial line of force and violence by a minority. When we refuse their proposals, they ignore our most solemn declarations, and try to make the people believe we are only lying. The result is this, that in those isolated cases where, among our new party members, we find tendencies toward conspiracy and force and violence, always and invariably this is the result of newspaper education or the work of stool-pigeons hired by employers' associations, which we must constantly fight to overcome and eradicate.

Just as the newspapers come to the defense of the wreckers, spies and fascist agents in the Soviet Union, and misrepresent

* See the Preamble and Article VI, Section I of "The Constitution and By-Laws of the Communist Party of the United States of America" adopted at the Tenth National Convention of the Party held in New York, May 27 to 31, 1938, where these principles are officially set forth.

the trials in Moscow and their significance, just so they work to confuse and obscure the true position of the Communist Party in the United States. In both cases, they act against the interests of democracy and progress, at home and throughout the world.

The Soviet Union, through Comrade Litvinov, but yesterday came forward with a history-making proposal for a conference of all peace-seeking governments to halt the fascist aggressions that are shaking the whole world. On the same day, the city of Barcelona was shattered with a terrible aerial bombardment by German and Italian planes, dropping bombs, to our shame must we say, some of which were but recently shipped from the United States. And on the same day, Secretary of State Hull of the Roosevelt cabinet, made a speech calling for concerted action to maintain the sanctity of treaties and world peace.

Let these events, outstanding among the thousands which cry for the same judgment, be the test of the Moscow trials and their significance to the world. If the Soviet Union can confidently take such initiative for peace, if the whole world can be confident that the Soviet Union has the solidarity and power to back it up with action, if this can so clearly coincide with the interests of America, as interpreted by our most representative and respected officials—then clearly we must declare, and all honest people must join us in declaring: "By their fruits ye shall know them." The spies and wreckers condemned in the recent trials, represented all the dark forces of decay and corruption, leading to war, fascism, and destruction of civilization. Such forces are at work everywhere throughout the world, not least in the United States. The Soviet Union has cleansed itself of these vermin, and stands strong and ready for the supreme test which will decide the destiny of the world; it stands shoulder to shoulder with the best thought and the best men produced by American democracy. In a world of chaos and disintegration and economic crisis, it is forging a new life of

plenty and happiness for its people. The Soviet Union, with Comrade Stalin at its head, can do these things because it had united 180 million people into an indissoluble solidarity, based upon socialism, and because it has learned to search out and destroy all the enemies of progress, of democracy, and of peace.

These are the main lessons of the Moscow trials. Let us ponder them well, let us study them in all their detailed ramifications, let us make them clear to the millions of the American people, and let us use these lessons to forge still more strongly together the common front of all democratic forces in our own land, to fight for democracy, for jobs, for security, and for peace, for the entire American people.

Address delivered at the Hippodrome, New York, March 18, 1938.

PART TWO

THE SEPTEMBER DAYS

I

The World Issue—
Defend Democracy and Peace

News from Europe and the Far East casts a lurid illumination upon the issues of the 1938 elections in the United States. Throughout the world the dominant issue is the defense of democracy and peace against the attacks of fascism and war. That is the issue between Hitler and the Czechoslovakian republic, that is the issue in Spain, that is the issue in China. The world teeters on the precipice of a general slaughter, dragged there by the fascist war-making governments of Germany, Italy and Japan. Within each country, the same alignment of forces is taking place as between countries. That is essentially the new alignment within American political life. Only in this light can we fully penetrate beneath the apparent chaos of our election struggles and understand the real forces that are contending for power.

Allow me, first of all, to make some comments upon the most spectacular news of the day, the flight of Prime Minister Chamberlain to Berchtesgaden for a personal talk with Hitler. In many ways it is unprecedented. But in one important respect it follows a recent example, one which had also been the result of Mr. Chamberlain's policy. Not many months ago, the head of an independent State flew to Berchtesgaden for a personal talk with Hitler. At that time also there was much talk of a "plebescite," of "appeasement," of "peaceful solution." Today the independent State is only a historical memory, and the man who flew to Berchtesgaden is in a fascist concentration camp. That State was Austria, and the man was Mr. Schuschnigg. Prime Minister Chamberlain, who caused his fateful journey

and its result, had evidently planned the same trip for the spokesman of Czechoslovakia. When Benes and Hodza refused the role assigned to them, Mr. Chamberlain took it upon himself. It is not clear whether he intends that Great Britain will also assume the consequences for his country, or whether he merely looks upon himself as a proxy for Benes and Czechoslovakia. I may be permitted to express the opinion that neither aim will be accepted by the peoples of Czechoslovakia or of Britain. The Chamberlain policy is finally bankrupt; it is no longer possible to purchase a false and hypocritical peace by throwing the weaker nations one after another to the fascist wolves. If Chamberlain is going to Hitler to deliver to him the defenses of the Czechoslovakian republic, through the transparent hypocrisy of "plebescite," then it only means that Chamberlain's government has decided to go down in the crash of European and world peace. That way lies certain universal world slaughter.

But we who do not abandon the struggle for peace, who know that the fascist madmen can be halted in their wild course by unity of all peace-loving peoples, we who are the overwhelming majority of the world's population, we demand the end to all concession to the war-makers, the unconditional support of Czechoslovakian independence and democracy, the final consolidation of the peace front of the world.

The spotlight is on Central Europe at this moment. But let us not forget the Far East, where the fate of half of the world will be decided. The spokesman for the Mikado's government, in Tokyo, yesterday declared its readiness to make war generally in support of Hitler's demand for unconditional surrender of world democracy. His exact words are significant. He said: "Japan is ready to fight—by arms if necessary—to defeat Communism's attempt to bolshevize Europe." That is the slogan of the Triple Alliance of fascism for the military conquest

of the world—the self-styled "Anti-Communist Alliance"—to save the world from Communism.

Hitler and Mussolini invaded Spain and fight to destroy that republic—to save it from Communism! Italy raped Ethiopia presumably to save that land from the Communism of the Negus! Japan has occupied half of China and killed several million Chinese men, women, and children—on the declared purpose to save that country from Communism! And now Hitler, with the support of Mussolini and the Mikado, threatens to destroy Czechoslovakia to save that little country and the world—from Communism! It is well known that the same judges of the world look upon the Popular Front government of France as an example of Communism! Democracy itself is denounced by them as incipient Communism which must be nipped in the bud, before it gets a chance to develop! And if France, Spain, Czechoslovakia and China are outstanding examples of the "menace of Communism," how much more so must be the administration of President Roosevelt and the New Deal in the United States! It is well-known that the fascist powers look upon our country as "Red" in almost exactly the same terms they use for the Soviet Union, the only Communist land in the world!

Now let us come back to our own country and have a look at our election struggle, in the light of world-wide issues and alignments. Hardly any political group or leader in America will admit being fascist. In fact, all are busy warning America against fascism. That is a good sign, inasmuch as it proves that America is so deeply and consciously anti-fascist, so overwhelmingly condemns the war-making powers, that even the spokesmen of fascism in our public life do not dare show openly their real face, on pain of immediately being buried in an avalanche of public repudiation.

But can we believe that, unlike the rest of the world, fascism has no forces in America? Such a thought would be infantile,

indeed! And to find these fascist forces in America, we should not spend too much time looking at their lunatic fringe, the open Nazi Bunds, the Silver Shirts and so on. Much more to the point is this, to ask: "Which camp, which groups, which candidates, are following the Hitler strategy, are operating under the world-slogan of fascism?"

The answer to this question is an infallible guide to the primary elections, and to the final balloting in November. Every candidate and group which operates under the chief slogan of "Fight against Communism" is following the Hitler strategy, is attaching himself to the world forces of the Triple Alliance of Germany, Italy and Japan, and represents the fascist threat against American democracy.

Who are these candidates and groups? You cannot recognize them by any of the old-time political flags. Some of them call themselves Democrats. Others call themselves Republicans. A few have even invaded the primaries of the American Labor Party. Some call themselves Socialists. There are even a few groups that mask themselves behind the false label of Communists—the Trotskyites and Lovestoneites. They all have one common and unifying feature—they shout that the chief issue is the menace of Communism, and explain that "Communism" so broadly that it includes President Roosevelt and the New Deal.

Since the Dies Committee got to work, we Communists certainly have been moving in high society. With Communists being found under every bed, we have not only learned for the first time that our followers seem to be in the majority but, more important, look at the "quality" of our associates. They give us credit for the World Youth Congress, representing forty million young people in fifty-five countries! They hand us the four millions of the American League for Peace and Democracy, with all the eminent men and women who sponsor and lead it! They hand us the C.I.O., and there is every sign

they will later be ready to give us the A. F. of L.! They assign to our ranks the most illustrious lady of the land, Eleanor Roosevelt! They give us the President himself! And, as the most delicious cherry to top off the dish, they present us with Shirley Temple!

Who could have imagined that the Communists had grown so tremendously, and in such high circles! There is really danger of getting the swelled-head!

But when our sworn enemies hand us millions of dollars worth of free advertising there must be a catch in it somewhere. They are making Communism a subject for discussion among the whole population, and making it popular by identifying it with everything democratic and progressive. Surely, they must have deep and serious motives for such a maneuver as this. They must be playing for big stakes, to be willing to pay such a price for their chips.

Yes, the reactionary political agents for Wall Street are playing for big stakes. They are making a desperate gamble to regain power over the United States. They know quite well that the Communist Party and its following are quite small, at the outside not more than five per cent of the population. They are not afraid of us. But they know equally well that seventy-five per cent of the population are united in support of Roosevelt and the New Deal, and that they have not the slightest chance of winning a general election if it is fought openly and honestly on the issue of New Deal policies and the public confidence in the President. Therefore, they want to vote for or against Communism, knowing the big majority does not know what it is and therefore are against it. They want to make a false issue, to split up and defeat the New Deal majority.

Don't think the issue can be avoided by agreeing that you, too, are against the Communist Party and its program, and by joining the Red-baiters in driving out the Communists, think thus to close the false issue. It just can't be done that way with

the reactionaries and fascists. Once the open Communists are put out of the way, then they will remind you of the even more dangerous *secret* Communists. And how will you know who they are? Only by establishing who proposes the same things the Communists supported. The Communists support President Roosevelt and the progressive New Deal policies; therefore, away with them, we must have a President above suspicion, someone like Jack Garner! The Communists supported the American Labor Party; therefore, outlaw it, as William Green has already attempted in the A. F. of L.! The Communists supported the Wage-Hour Bill—repeal it as insidious "boring from within"! The Communists were for the Ten Commandments—outlaw them! The Communists favored three meals per day for all workers—cut them down to two! And everybody who opposes this program is a *secret Communist* to be gotten rid of in the same way that they propose to abolish the open Communists!

That is the strategy of the reactionaries, of the allies of Hitler, of the agents of Wall Street and the economic royalists. If it works, the New Deal majority of the people are hopelessly split up and demoralized, the reactionaries ride back into power, the trade union movement is strangled, the people's organizations are suppressed—and America has taken the first steps on the sorrowful road to join the German people.

Today the old political flags and names are meaningless. Cutting across all the old labels and groupings and parties, there emerges the outlines of two new parties which embrace the entire population in two new camps. There is the New Deal Party and there is the Anti-New Deal Party. These are the only real national mass parties in the United States at this moment.

Victory for the New Deal Party means keeping our country on the path of a progressive and democratic development. Victory for the Anti-New Deal Party means going back to Hoover

and the Hoovervilles under a regime that would never give us another chance for a New Deal through Constitutional processes.

That is why the Communist Party clearly and without hesitation declares its support of the New Deal Party and policy, proposes and works for the unity of the majority of the people behind a single progressive candidate for each electoral office, subordinates itself and its own particular ideas to the necessity for this broadest unity of the majority of the people.

That is why in New York the Communist Party accepts and works for the success of the American Labor Party ticket, believing that it is the most important instrument for the unity of the majority of the people in this city and state.

No candidate or party that receives Communist support is under any special obligation to us, other than that obligation taken to the whole of their supporters. We have had no special voice in determining candidacies or platforms. We have not pressed any special claims or ideas of our own within the broad democratic front. We only claim our right and duty to join with the majority of the people to achieve the common aims upon which we all agree.

The reactionaries would like to make it appear that this is a terrible conspiracy on our part, a monstrous thing which all respectable people must join in rejecting. But by this they only reveal their own rejection of the American democratic tradition and practice. And they put themselves in a very peculiar position. Do they mean to imply that they demand that the Communists should, instead, support the candidates and policies of the Anti-New Deal Party? But if our support is supposed to damn the New Dealers and Labor Party men, why wouldn't it also damn the Anti-New Dealers? Then it must be that the reactionaries are demanding that the Communist Party must put up a complete ticket of its own and refuse to unite with anyone else. If this is what they mean, let them say

so frankly, and tell the public that it is they, the Anti-New Dealers, who want the Communists to come out and fight for public office, that they will take the responsibility for a Communist ticket that the Communists themselves would like to withdraw for the sake of unity of all progressive people. Of course, we must say, that whatever the reactionaries want of us, there is little likelihood that we will give it. We usually examine their wishes in order the better to defeat them.

The Communist Party is helping to unite the majority of the American people to defeat the candidates of Wall Street reaction, fascism and war. No Red-baiting campaign can frighten us or move us an inch from this path. And we warn the whole camp of progress and democracy, that they can make no concessions to the Red-baiters without seriously compromising their own cause and endangering the victory of the majority of the people. If you give one finger to the devil of Red-baiting, he will never be satisfied until he possesses your whole soul.

I have been informed that Mr. Louis Waldman, one of the candidates for a minor office on the American Labor Party ticket, has been indulging in some special Red-baiting of his own, and repudiating the support of the Communists among the great mass of followers of the Labor Party. In the special case of Mr. Waldman, and any one else of like mind, it may perhaps be necessary to provide for an exception to our general policy; if he gives us a letter demanding that we shall not support him, we shall probably have to oblige him by seeing to it that he receives no unwanted Communist votes to compromise his doubtful purity. We only hope that his agreement with the main slogan of J. J. O'Connor and Father Coughlin may not lead him in to more open political alignment with those gentlemen.

So far as we are concerned, everything we do or say is guided by one major consideration: Unity of the progressive majority

of the people at all costs! One single candidate to represent that unity, for each electoral office! We give this to you as the most faithful guide which can be found for the effective fight for democracy, for progress and for peace.

Of course, we must frankly say that the candidates and policies of the broad democratic front by no means correspond to what we think is necessary even to meet and solve the most immediate problems. The New Deal Party on a national scale is still unorganized, and is only beginning to hammer out its program. We have contributed our ideas on such a program to the general public discussion, bringing all the various lines of thought developed by the New Deal and the labor movement, into something like a systematic and rounded-out program based upon minimum democratic needs under the present capitalist system. We recommend it to the serious study of all.

It should not be necessary to repeat here, that there is nothing of Communism or socialism in the platform of the broad democratic front, of the New Deal or of its main support. Nor do we of the Communist Party propose to insert anything communistic or socialistic in it. We do not propose to "push Roosevelt to the left," as one brilliant idiot informed the Dies Committee. We of the Communist Party do not ask the American people to pass judgment on our ideas of the future development of society in the elections. We warn the people that it is only the reactionaries, the anti-New Dealers, the economic royalists, who raise the issue of Communism as the issue of this election, and they do it dishonestly, as a tricky maneuver, to break up the unity of the people who in their great majority support the course of President Roosevelt.

In the primary elections, and in the final balloting in November, the American people will be standing at an historical crossroads, choosing their course for many years to come. We will be deciding the immediate fate of our country. And the

course of the United States may easily become that factor which determines the fate of the entire world.

One of the outstanding merits of President Roosevelt has been his clear vision of the inter-relation of domestic with world affairs. When last October in Chicago, he made his historic declaration in favor of "quarantining the war-making powers," he was looking further and deeper into history than the majority of his own followers. He knew quite well that our country could not march forward on the democratic path successfully, if the rest of the world falls into the morass of fascism; he saw that we cannot have peace, if we facilitate the surrender of the rest of the world to the war-makers. He understood the decisive role that America, holding half of the world's effective wealth, might play in turning the scales toward international order and peace or toward anarchy, destruction and war. Since last October the vast majority of the people have learned that lesson. Today it is the President's direction against the war-makers, toward international co-operation for peace, which has the largest and most enthusiastic support among the people, even more decisively than his domestic policies.

The President is implementing this positive peace policy only in the most guarded and cautious manner. Clearly he is much disturbed by fears of the Machiavellian diplomacy of Mr. Chamberlain. He is not yet certain how far the American people have thought through this policy to its necessary conclusions in bold action that is needed to guarantee peace. All the more reason, then, that we here and all other meetings and groupings that support the peace policy of the President, shall discuss in more detail the concrete steps that our government could and should take to apply its policy, and to give the President the benefit of our counsels.

It is good that Roosevelt has made it clear to the world that the American people abhor warlike aggression and throw their moral influence on the side of the victims of aggression. But we

should each and everyone of us, as well as our organizations, write to the President, to Secretary Hull and to the press, urging in this critical hour that our government declare: That the United States is prepared to consult with all governments wishing to preserve orderly relations, on the means required to restrain those powers which demonstrate an intention to break up these orderly relations by military aggressions; that in such consultations the United States is prepared to exert its full moral and economic influence to secure the enforcement of the general will to peace.

We should further point out, that the universal aggressive operations of German fascism, which is conducting an economic war against the United States, has already brought that country under the provisions of existing legislation, which authorizes the President to cut off all trade by a general embargo, and call upon the President to register our protest against this universal aggression by immediately applying that embargo.

We should never allow it to be forgotten, that Czechoslovakia and the problem of its protection is merely part of the world situation; that China occupies a front line trench for the protection of the rest of the world; that America cannot continue complacently to supply Japan with more than half of munitions of war to murder and subjugate the Chinese people, except at most dire peril to its own future; that we must move decisively toward a complete embargo against Japan.

We must finally wipe out the shame of our assistance to the fascist powers in their invasion of Spain, by lifting the embargo on that republic and opening our markets wide to the Spanish people.

For Spain, we must at all costs win some active material help from the American people, corresponding in some measure to the almost universal sympathy that exists. Especially now, when general war mobilization threatens to cut Spain off from her life-line of foodstuffs with the Soviet Union, we must realize

that if Spain shall be fed during the coming period it can only be from America. The Spanish people have not hesitated to shed their blood without limit for the preservation of the republic, for the defense of world democracy as well as their own. They have been far too modest in their demands upon us, and far too patient under our shameful cancellation of their treaty rights with us, not to speak of our own abandonment of all international law. The people of the United States, if we seriously mean to do anything to halt the war-makers and preserve peace, must assume the task of feeding Spain.

This is no great task for the American people. In fact, one of our most embarrassing domestic problems is a *surplus of farm products*, in which our government is investing hundreds of millions of dollars, and for which there is no immediate market. Instead of allowing this farm surplus to deteriorate in the warehouses, or to be destroyed, we should demand that it be sent to Spain on liberal credit terms, and thus help our own economy at the same time we perform a positive service to Spain and the world.

Every one of these proposals is solidly based upon conservative precedent, upon traditional American principles and upon established international law and the Kellogg Pact, solemnly ratified by all the nations of the world. And who can doubt that if these steps were taken by the United States government, that they would tremendously improve the chances for maintaining world peace? If we rouse the American people to actively advise and demand these things from our government, as the necessary steps to carry out its own declared policy, we will be reviving the best American democratic traditions, we will be making democracy work, we will really be defending democracy and peace.

Allow me to conclude with a few words about the Soviet Union and its relations to the United States and to the world. I wish to address myself especially to those who do not approve

or understand the new socialist society of the Soviet Union, and who do not want socialism in the United States. You, my liberal and conservative friends, are deeply interested in maintaining peace, and you know that the threatening general war will be the greatest catastrophe the world has ever witnessed. Do you not see that the Soviet Union, by always following a policy of peace, has the trust and confidence of all its neighbors? Do you not see that there is no weak nation that fears aggression from the Soviet Union? Do you understand why France and Czechoslovakia have found their surest protection against aggression in the mutual-defense pact with the Soviet Union? Do you see that the Soviet Union's good neighbor policy toward China has been that unhappy land's only resource to withstand a Japanese conquest? Do you understand that if Japan could harness China's four hundred million people to her war machine, that a Japanese war of aggression against the United States would be inevitable?

All these are indisputable facts. When you face them, then ask yourself the further question: Is not the Soviet Union, by its policies, helping the world toward stability, democracy, international order and peace? Are not these policies in the interests of the American people also?

Of course they are! Is there any person who would dare suggest that the Soviet Union should follow different policies?

There are reactionaries who suggest that the United States may itself become involved in war with the Soviet Union. Allow me to point out that such a war would be possible only under two sets of circumstances: One would be, if our own anti-New Deal crowd should get into power in the U.S., joined with the fascists, and with them made war against the Soviet Union to destroy the socialist society. That will not happen, because the majority of the American people are going to remain united around the New Deal and President Roosevelt's

peace policy. The second would be, if in the Soviet Union the fascist agents and spies, the Trotskyites and Bukharinites, had been able to succeed in their recent conspiracy to seize the government there. That will never happen because, having tried and failed, they will never get another chance to try again.

We have every evidence then, for convincing even the most conservative but peace-loving American, that the Soviet Union is a power for peace in the world, that it is serving the interests of America in world affairs, and that it is and will remain the firm friend of the American people and nation.

This is an important fact. Upon its recognition depends the full development of that international co-operation which is so necessary to maintain a measure of peace in this war-torn world. The two most powerful nations in this world are precisely these two countries, the United States and the Soviet Union. At the same time they are the two countries most devoted to world peace.

For the same reasons that the Soviet Union is the firm support of all peoples seeking democracy and peace, on a world scale, the small Communist Party in the United States, where we still have to win the people to socialism, stands in the front ranks of the defenders of democracy and peace here in this country.

The Communists of the whole world are working in the same direction.

With these facts, which can be easily verified by every honest citizen who has escaped from the fantastic, mad-house, atmosphere of the Dies Committee and the Red-baiting circles, we will break through the strategy of the Anti-New Deal Party of reaction and monopoly capital. We will help the progressive majority of the American people to maintain their unity, to maintain their control of the destinies of our country. We will help to achieve a smashing victory for progress and democracy

in the primaries and in the November elections. We will help turn the tide of American and world events away from reaction, fascism and war, and toward a future of peace, plenty and prosperity for all the people.

Address delivered at the Velodrome, Coney Island, New York, September 15, 1938.

II

Unity for Peace

With the world balanced on the precipice of war, the people of the United States and those of all American countries are finally crystallizing their position against the fascist war-making powers. All subterfuges to evade the issue have been smashed by Hitler's violent demand for the unconditional surrender of Czechoslovakia and thereby of world democracy, backed up by the greatest mobilization ever witnessed in what is still technically "peace-time." World democracy is choosing between the alternatives: "Unite or surrender."

The carefully guarded but nonetheless clear calls of President Roosevelt for world unity of the democratic forces, have encouraged and strengthened the forces of peace everywhere. Together with the unequivocal and positive peace policy of the Soviet Union, implemented from day to day by Maxim Litvinov and backed by the will of 180 million strong, united Soviet people, led by Joseph Stalin, this presents the hope for world peace around which are rallying all the peace forces of the world.

It is on this background that we must evaluate the speech of John L. Lewis on September 11, at the International Congress Against War and Fascism meeting in Mexico City. With this background the speech emerges as one of the great, really historic utterances in the present tragic moment of world history.

"We meet here," declared Lewis, "to give common expression to our purpose of preservation of democratic institutions against the menace of interests who want to destroy them. Democracy has always had its enemies. Now they have organized themselves under the black flag of fascism.... Between

us and fascism there can be no peace. We join hands with all other workers in this hemisphere and the whole world to fight against our common enemy."

In these words spoke the conscience and will of American labor. Lewis emerged, with this speech, not merely as the greatest American trade-union leader, not only as one of the most potent representatives of American democracy, but as a leader of world democracy. American labor takes its rightful position in the vanguard of the world struggle against fascism and war.

Leon Jouhaux, head of the Confederation of Labor of France, spoke from the same platform with Lewis and in the same terms, on behalf of the great united labor movement of his land—the backbone and sinews of the *Front Populaire* which snatched France from the jaws of fascism by uniting Radicals, Socialists and Communists into a bloc of the majority of the people.

Ramon Gonzales Pena, of the United Labor Federation of Spain, and Minister of Justice in the Spanish republic, stood side by side with Lewis, representing a people which has been pouring out its blood in torrents for the same cause.

From almost all Latin American countries, the outstanding leaders of labor, the most able and trusted, were there to utter the same sentiments, to express the same determination, to make the same pledge.

Vicente Lombardo Toledano, head of the Mexican Confederation of Labor (CTM) and leader of the Mexican people, was the chief organizer of this historic gathering.

President Lázaro Cárdenas of Mexico welcomed the congress, and branded the fascist war-makers as the "avowed enemies of civilization." Ramon Gonzales Pena hailed Cárdenas as "the first President who declared before his Parliament that it is a legitimate undertaking to sell arms to the Spanish republic."

And fifty thousand Mexicans joined with the delegates, in

the Stadium of Mexico City, to cheer this alliance of the American peoples for peace and democracy. Fifty million workers of the Americas will join with the same enthusiasm when the call reaches them sharply and clearly.

That is the task now, to carry the historic call of the International Congress and the historic words of John L. Lewis, to the broadest masses of the workers, farmers and all the common people.

How pitifully bankrupt, how shamefully treasonable, are revealed the hysterical denunciations of William Green, who jabbered slanders against the congress in Mexico City in the jargon of Mr. Dies and the rest of the fascist Red-baiters. At the moment when Hitler threatens the whole world with slaughter and destruction, they can find nothing better to do than echo the slogans of the "Anti-Communist Alliance" of Hitler, Mussolini and the Mikado.

The peoples of America are uniting with world democracy to halt once and for all the advance of fascism, to preserve peace and democracy.

Now we must emphasize a hundredfold that high aspirations are not enough, splendid words must be followed by deeds. *Unity for action!*

Unity for action means, first of all, the lifting of the criminal blockade from republican Spain. But it means more than that. It means help, serious, practical help, to the Spanish people. And first of all, it means that the United States must come forward to help feed the heroic but starving Spanish people. Our country has such a surplus of foodstuffs that its disposal has become an embarrassing problem. Send our surplus food to Spain!

Unity for action means, to stop the shameful traffic with Japanese imperialism in its murder of the Chinese people. An embargo against Japan must be laid, to be lifted only when

the Japanese armies have retired from the Chinese republic!

Unity of the workers, unity of the peoples, unity of all the forces of democracy, within the United States and on an international scale—this is the slogan of the hour!

New Masses, September 20, 1938.

III

Stop the Sell-Out!

CHAMBERLAIN has come into the open as the accomplice of Hitler. By covering his crime with the melodramatic flight to Berchtesgaden under the cry of "peace," he expects to dragoon British labor into support of his treason, and to smash the Popular Front in France, an aim long close to his heart. Fanatically pursuing the narrowest class interests of British monopoly capital, Chamberlain and his associates are striking at the heart of the last hopes of world peace and democracy. It is the blackest and most open treason ever registered in modern history. Through the betrayal of Czechoslovakia, world peace and democracy are to be betrayed.

A storm of protest must and will arise from all the world. From every peace-loving people must come the repudiation of this cynical treachery. Especially from the American people, who hold the greatest power to influence world events, and who have the most advantageous position to influence events for peace without immediate risks to themselves. It is the height of demagogy to cry out against the crimes of other lands if we of the United States should be influenced by those Pharisees who preach at us to pass by on the other side.

The Hitler aggression against the Czechoslovakian republic is one of the sharp points of universal aggression, directed against the whole world. Not least is it against the United States. The wild uprisings staged in the last months by Hitler's forces in Mexico, in Brazil and in Chile are only slight indications of what is to come when Hitler gets into his stride. The idiotic ravings of the Dies committee show how high within

our own government do Hitler's direct accomplices reach. And for years one of the principal problems of our Commerce and State Departments has been how to cope with the measures of economic war being waged by Hitler against the United States, in the form of trade practices directly contrary to every established policy of the United States and of every other democratic country.

It is time that the policy of surrender to fascism, of which Chamberlain gives the most dastardly example, be stopped all down the line, in big and little things. The United States should and must establish its own independent initiative to this end, not only from motives of human solidarity, but even from its most selfish national interests.

What are the minimum measures for implementing an American policy for peace in the present moment?

Two steps by Washington would decisively change the atmosphere of panic engendered by the accomplices of Hitler. They are minimum steps, they do not solve the problems, they are carefully buttressed in established American traditions, principles and legislation—but they have the merit of posing a more realistic estimate of the relation of forces in the world, and show that democracy still has teeth short of war. These two measures would be:

First, a declaration by the President that the United States, vitally interested in international order and peace, is prepared to discuss with all signatories of the Kellogg Pact those common measures which will become necessary to realize the aims of that solemn treaty if the present disturbances between nations continue.

Second, a declaration by the President, under the authorization of Section 338 of the Tariff Act, that the economic aggressions by Germany, foreseen by that act, have increased and become an established system, which can only be countered by

the United States by applying the full measure provided in the act—that is, by embargo on German trade with the United States.

For several years now, the spokesmen of the United States have been reading excellent moral lessons to the aggressors who drag the world to war. More and more, the response to these moral rebukes has come in the form of jeers and insults. Nothing more is to be gained by high-sounding words; they will contribute nothing to world peace, and will only dissipate our country's prestige and moral weight. The next word must be such as will carry weight—or it had better not be spoken. Mild words, but such as convey a businesslike determination toward peace, backed up by even a minimum of action, are worth a volume of the most brilliant generalities. We propose nothing more than that at this moment, when the fate of world peace is in the balance, because we are convinced even this small contribution—because it passes from words to deeds—might easily make all the difference between maintenance of what peace is left in the world and universal slaughter and catastrophe.

Hitler and all his helpers have set the world stage to place before the peace-loving majority of the world the alternative: Surrender or War!

They want the world to believe that the struggle for democracy and peace has come to an end, that it is hopeless, that the war-makers hold all the trump cards.

That is a typical fascist lie, a lie on the grand scale, the lie to suck out the fighting spirit from the democracies, to sap their morale, to spread defeatism among the masses of the peoples.

The fight for peace is only beginning. British labor is already shaking itself free from the shackles of Sir Walter Citrine and Chamberlain. British labor moves very slowly, it is not easily

provoked to action, but there is every indication that it is stirred to its depths by Chamberlain's attempted treason. And when British labor begins to move, it is a mighty colossus which can sweep away Chamberlain's power overnight. Let Chamberlain consult Winston Churchill on this point—that same Churchill who cracked his shins on Labor's Councils of Action in 1920, when he tried to use British power to restore the old order in Russia.

French labor, which has already been given a little foretaste of what a future of following Chamberlain has in store for it, has not agreed with Daladier to surrender the future of all France as well as the future of French labor to the ukase from Berchtesgaden.

And America has not yet spoken its final word. It will be a grievous mistake for the war-makers to think that the hesitation of America to speak that word arises from any doubts as to what kind of word it is to be. It will be an even more grievous mistake to conclude that the people of the United States are becoming pacifists willing to surrender democracy and peace to the world bandits. The fate of the world cannot be decided without the United States. And the United States is on the side of democracy and peace.

Let there be no mistake about this. Let the voice of America be heard, the voice of labor and of the people, first of all in our national councils in Washington, in meetings and in the press, and on the streets.

Let there be a mighty roar of protest against the treason of Chamberlain.

Let there be bold but coldly cautious counsels pressed upon our national spokesmen in Washington!

Let there be full knowledge given the world, that America will never surrender to world fascism, that America is ready to help the world stop its surrender to fascism!

War can still be stopped. Peace can still be saved! Democracy can still be preserved! But the hour is growing short.

The people of America must speak!

New Masses, September 27, 1938.

IV

Two Cables from Paris

PARIS, Oct. 4.—The Communist parliamentary group met today. The chairman was Arthur Ramette, who had just been demobilized. I was present at the meeting and was greeted by the chairman in the name of the Central Committee of the French Communist Party and the Parliamentary group, after a report by Maurice Thoréz, General Secretary.

The parliamentary group instructed Gabriel Peri, Vice-President of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Chamber of Deputies and foreign editor of *L'Humanite*, to speak in the Chamber against the shameful dictate of Munich, which compromises the great cause of human peace and sacrifices the security of France.

Besides, this group of Communist Deputies and Senators instructed the Communist members of the Army Committee of the Chamber to write General Gustave Gamelin, Chief of the General Staff, to stress the danger for the security of France resulting from giving to Hitler the defense line of Czechoslovakia constructed on the plans of the Maginot Line.

The parliamentary group protested against the prohibition on public meetings and unanimously adopted the following resolution:

The Communist Parliamentary Group addresses its fraternal greeting to the Czechoslovakian people, who are the victims of the shameful Munich dictate.

At Munich, reneging their solemn engagements and treaties which were the foundation of French security and constituted an essential guarantee for safeguarding of peace, Chamberlain and Daladier delivered up to Hitler a friendly people and ally of France.

Faithful to the will of the people and defending the vital interests of France, the Communist group refuses to associate itself with the act of brigandage perpetrated at Munich.

It has decided to take up again before the Chamber the resolution which the Socialist parliamentary group voted on September 21, after the Hitler-Chamberlain interview at Berchtesgaden which constituted a step toward the Munich dictate.

This resolution said: "The Socialist group cannot give its solidarity to diplomatic action which results in imposing on a state without its having been consulted and under the menace of aggression, the sacrifice of its independence, an action which results in isolating France and in precipitating an armaments race and thereby in aggravating the risk of war."

The dictate of Munich can have no other consequences than a foreign policy implying the abandonment of the rights of the peoples and an internal policy carrying in its wake the development of a reactionary offensive against the demands of the workers, peasants and middle classes, to the profit of international high finance.

The Communist group protests against such a policy. It demands a government respectful of the people's will, a government whose policy will assure well-being and peace for the country with dignity and honor.

Daily Worker, October 5, 1938.

PARIS, Oct. 7.—France and England are covered with posters hysterically calling upon the people to rejoice that "peace is saved."

Chamberlain and Daladier have presented the Munich "Holy Alliance" to the parliaments with an ultimatum of endorsement or war.

Meanwhile the Munich betrayal is already an accomplished fact.

The Munich "Big Four" acted as an effective dictatorship, even over the heads of and against the French Cabinet, fearing to present anything but an irreversible destruction of all the foundations of concerted action the peace-loving peoples have painfully built through the years.

Even before the British Parliament rendered a shotgun verdict, Hitler brazenly revised the Munich terms of occupation of Czechoslovakia with the slavish approval of his new allies.

The French Chamber of Deputies, discussing foreign relations for the first time since before the occupation of Austria, gave fifteen minutes to each political party to explain its vote.

Gabriel Peri, Communist Vice-President of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Chamber, prophesied that soon the only function of the Chamber will be to stand up and sit down.

Among the parliamentary groups, only the Communists plus a few scattered individuals, unreservedly denounced and voted against the surrender of Europe to Hitler and the formation of the Munich "Holy Alliance."

All signs indicate that the masses, while dreading and hating war, refuse the invitations to rejoice at the false peace.

There is growing realization in all circles that such a peace must be purchased each day anew at an ever higher price and with diminished possibility to refuse payment.

The costs of the Munich "Holy Alliance" already fill the people with dismay. This peace can only be maintained by constantly more rapid surrender of the whole world to fascist dictatorship.

Those Americans who urge Europe to continue such a false peace must realize that very quickly, with Europe under its heel, the Fascist "Holy Alliance" will turn with typical thoroughness to the rich pickings of the Americas.

At that moment the American people will call in vain for European allies whom we have assisted to destruction by refusing to help when they were fighting the battles of all progressive mankind.

Already today London signaled that the next job of the Munich dictators will be to liquidate the Spanish republic.

Chamberlain is reported preparing a new plan calling for

surrender of the Spanish republic on pain of the Munich alliance joining the invasion with a complete blockade.

This is at a moment when Franco is suffering continued military reverses and also faces serious disturbances in the rear.

The heroic Spanish People's Army numbering close to a million, clearly outclasses the Franco fascists in everything except the technical equipment furnished by Hitler and Mussolini.

They are preparing a counter-offensive in which the Munich alliance plans to strangle by blockade and starvation. The Spanish Republic is prepared to fight to the end, but must receive at least food from the world democracies.

Spain is the cultural motherland of Latin America. We warn the people of the United States that if fascism, already the hegemony of Europe, is permitted thus to crush the Spanish republic, the consequences to all the Americas will be swift and catastrophic.

The United States must feed Spain. That is the demand of solidarity of progressive humanity. That is equally the demand of even the narrowest national interests of the present-day United States. That also coincides with the only possible solution of the domestic crop surplus.

The widest mass demand must arise that the United States feed Spain.

Meantime every admirer of the heroic Spanish people, every conscious progressive will strengthen and redouble direct material help organized under the Medical Bureau and North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy, which are now completing the first All-American food ship for Spain.

Daily Worker, October 8, 1938.

V

The United States and the New International Situation

In September, at the time of the highest point of the crisis evoked by Hitler's threats of aggression against Czechoslovakia, Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States, twice intervened in the European conflict. His appeal for peace and his proposal to convene an international conference for settlement of the questions in dispute were a very important refutation of those who wish to make out that the United States will in all circumstances keep to its policy of isolation. It is also clear, however, that this intervention by President Roosevelt was determined not by general humanitarian or pacifist considerations, but above all by the interests of America and recognition of the fact that two oceans alone are not capable of protecting the United States of America from the expansionist designs of the fascist bloc.

As a matter of fact, as a result of the new reactionary bloc formed at Munich, which seriously changed the international situation, drawing into the anti-democratic, counter-revolutionary bloc the imperialist reactionary forces of Great Britain and France, the role of the United States and of the Americas becomes even more decisive. The Munich bloc, following the dismemberment of Czechoslovakia, is proceeding next to attempt to liquidate the Spanish republic.

At the same time the capitulation of the Western Powers to Hitler, the attempt of Chamberlain and Daladier to adapt Britain and France to the expansionist efforts of Hitler's "world political triangle," will unquestionably also strengthen the hands of the Japanese militarists in their drive for the

conquest of China and the Pacific. Thus the menace of fascism, hitherto considered by the United States as primarily a European problem, becomes world-wide and directly strikes against the national interests of the U.S.A. and against American democracy.

The fight between democracy and fascism for Spain has a far greater importance for the American continent than might seem at the first glance. Having closed the doors of Europe against the U.S.A., fascism hopes in Spain to secure the key to the great Latin American continent, which, with the collaboration or the neutrality of the British navy, it considers ripe for conquest, and with the strengthening of the hands of Japanese imperialism they hope to close the doors of the Pacific.

The third object of attack of the "world-political triangle" is Canada. The fascists hope, by means of the Empire connections to break Canada away from her orientation upon the U.S.A. and to incorporate her into the Chamberlain plan. The United States, thus encircled, is expected to be forced into submission to the Munich bloc and into the service of its plans for a world hegemony.

The democracy of the U.S.A. is faced with the necessity to choose its course, either of surrender or of struggle—a struggle in which victory is possible only on condition of close alliance with the forces of peace and democracy in all lands.

The question of the relationship between the U.S.A. and the Soviet Union becomes of first and most pressing importance. It is necessary to bring out clearly and to stress the many common interests of these two great lands, their many parallel characteristics, the common enemies of both. It is necessary more broadly and energetically to popularize the socialist construction in the U.S.S.R., its rapid cultural advance and its consistent peace policy, all of which have special appeal to the American toilers in the present conditions of economic crisis, cultural reaction and fascist menace of war.

In America itself the struggle for an active peace policy on the part of the U.S.A. and for the preservation of democracy requires for its success the unity of all democratic and progressive forces into a single front against reaction, against the fascists and war-makers. The keystone of the united democratic front is the unity of the working class, and its growing power. Thus the struggle for a positive peace policy is integrally bound up with the progressive and democratic platform on all domestic questions, and the working class struggle for better conditions of life.

It is now especially necessary to strengthen the ideological and political connections between the American democratic camp (especially of the working class) and its corresponding forces in other lands in Europe, in Asia, in South America, in Canada. Every opportunity must be seized for extending and strengthening these ties through international congresses, conferences and delegations of the trade unions, of the peace movement, of the youth, etc. Especially valuable will be the international gatherings held in the U.S.A. and the Pan-American Democratic Conference. The influence of the democratic and labor camps of the U.S.A. must be spread throughout the world, and in this process the movement of the U.S.A. must be confirmed, deepened and strengthened in its international outlook, understanding and organizational ties.

The means at the disposal of the United States for active participation in the fight for peace are numerous, as are also the tasks which confront the democratic and labor movement. It is necessary to win the country in its majority for the slogan "Food for Spain" and to realize it through government credits for the purchase of surplus wheat and cotton, now withheld from the market in enormous quantities to avert collapse of the agricultural prices. While strengthening the boycott of Japanese goods it is necessary to pass on with all forces to the

establishment of an embargo against all trade with Japan, thus ending the shameful situation in which Mussolini's press hack, Gayda, could answer the peaceful solicitation of the United States government with the jeering reminder that Japan's crimes in China are committed with the economic means purchased from the U.S.A. itself at the very moment when the U.S.A. is expressing its moral condemnation and abhorrence of these crimes.

Public collections for immediate direct aid to Spain in all forms must be pushed with vigor and made one of the chief vehicles for organizing mass pressure for governmental action. The projects under discussion in governmental circles for a large-scale industrialization loan to China must be popularized in their two-fold aspect, as measures of economic recovery at home, providing orders for American industries and jobs for American workers, as well as for halting the war-making aggressors in the Pacific, and strengthening the forces of international order and peace.

Hitler has long been fighting against America's influence in Latin America by means of economic and trade war. United States laws already provide weapons of economic self-defense against such aggression by means of raising customs duties or placing an embargo on trade with the offending nation. These laws have not been applied to Hitler Germany. A mass demand for an embargo against Hitler Germany must be raised, with motives of American self-defense pressed equally with those of solidarity with the victims of violent aggression.

The campaign against the aggressor governments of Germany, Italy and Japan and their new allies in the Munich Pact must be combined with encouragement to and friendship for the toiling peoples and intellectuals suffering under such governments. Fascist barbarism and bandit-aggression and the demagogic treason of their accomplices are not characteristic of

any of the peoples but only of a small ruling class representing monopoly capital and its underworld of degenerate and corrupt agents, whose overthrow is equally in the interest of the peoples governed by them as of the peoples threatened by them.

Written in Paris, October 11, 1938; published in *World News and Views*, Vol. 18, No. 52, October 29, 1938.

VI

The Elections and the International Situation

Tonight I propose to discuss the elections of November 8 in the light of the world situation as it develops since the Munich Pact and the destruction of Czechoslovakia.

Everyone begins to see that the issues of our elections are the same as divide the whole world; the regrouping of the peoples and governments of the world into two opposing camps follow the same general lines as the regrouping within American politics into two new camps. The issue in the world situation is fascist war-making aggression and its allies, against the peace-loving and democratic peoples. And that is the issue and the alignment in our own November elections.

The forces of the people are great, but as yet unorganized. The forces of reaction are limited, but highly compact, organized, and knowing what they want and how they propose to get it.

Our problem, therefore, becomes that of obtaining and preserving the unity of the majority of the people, against all the wiles and ferocity of attack of the reactionaries. If the majority of decent, progressive, democratically-minded people can unite and act together, they can rule the United States and solve all our problems. If they divide, then reaction and the power of the economic royalists will ride rough-shod into power, and take our country toward fascism.

I have just returned from a visit to Europe. There I saw country after country falling into the ferocious clutches of fascism, as a result of retreat and surrender of their trusted leaders. And these peoples were unable to halt these retreats

and surrenders, because they had allowed themselves to be divided.

We have been told that peace was brought to a distracted world by the Pact of Munich. But that bandit agreement of Hitler, Mussolini, Chamberlain and Daladier destroyed the Czechoslovak republic, the last remnant of democracy in Central Europe. That Pact delivered the largest part of Europe under control of Hitler the war-maker, and enormously multiplied his ability to make war. It destroyed the last structure of peace in Europe.

They call this "peace"! But this is not peace! What is going on is war, war on three continents, uninterrupted war. It began as civil war against the German people, and subjected them to a regime so horrible as to shock the whole world. The war was carried into Spain, as a war of invasion. It marched into Austria, wiping out that state overnight. It has destroyed Czechoslovakia. It has invaded Africa, and destroyed the Ethiopian people. It has involved half of Asia, and brought death to millions of Chinese men, women and children.

This is war, brutal, relentless, catastrophic. But the extension of this war, the triumph of the war-makers, is handed to the world as the achievement of "peace!" Falsehood can descend to no lower depths than this!

Examine for a moment the results of the Munich Pact, in the few short weeks that have elapsed. Japanese armies, contemptuous now of all restraining influences, have extended their invasion to South China, occupied Canton, control all Chinese ports, captured Hankow, and announce themselves masters of China, threatening all who dare give aid to China as called for by the League of Nations. The Munich Powers announced a project for "peace" in Spain according to the Czechoslovakian example. Hitler begins openly to dictate not only the policies but also the personnel of the British and French governments. Mussolini insultingly warns the United States that

the fate of China awaits us. And in Berlin the plans for conquest of Latin America, long prepared, are put in motion, with the assurance of at least the neutrality of the British Navy, if not its collaboration. Americans who have been saying "Thank God for the Atlantic and Pacific oceans," thinking of these water as barriers to fascist aggression, suddenly wake up to find them transformed into broad highways.

The universal opinion of mankind on the Munich Pact, behind all the hypocritical slobber about "peace," is the decisions taken by every government to multiply their armaments immediately.

The facts are undoubted and incontestable. The only difference of opinion that is possible is this: Shall the United States approve and follow the path of the Munich Powers, or shall we condemn and resist the path of Munich? Shall we surrender to the war-makers and become their servants, or shall we seriously take up the fight for a real, that is a democratic, peace? Last week we heard the voices of two spokesmen representing the two opposite sides on this question which involves the fate of the world. Herbert Hoover spoke up as the champion of Munich and the policy of Chamberlain. President Roosevelt declared there can be no peace under threat of force, as a result of surrender to the threat of war.

Herbert Hoover won the loud and immediate applause of Berlin. President Roosevelt received the enthusiastic approbation of the peace-loving masses of the people everywhere his voice could penetrate.

Make no mistake about it, all those who are conducting such a vicious campaign of hatred against President Roosevelt and the New Deal, represent the same forces that brought us the "peace" of Munich and all its consequences.

That is the significance of the Munich Pact, and the world situation, in relation to the elections on November 8. Those men, groups or parties, who stand for a democratic peace and against

a Hitler "peace," are the same who fight for fuller democracy and a better life for the American people in our domestic affairs, while those who advocate "peace" through submission to Hitler are the same who would limit, choke and try to destroy American democracy, trade unionism and the American standard of living, in the interests of the economic royalists.

The democracy of the United States is faced with the necessary choice either to surrender or fight. To surrender is simple: "peace" of the Munich type can always be purchased so long as people are ready to pay the price, and then Hitler will solve all other problems for us. To fight, and to win through to victory, is hard and difficult, and requires the close alliance and unity of all forces, that can be rallied, in America and throughout the world.

The situation calls for the unity of all progressive and democratic forces in the United States, to guarantee that, come what may, our country will never surrender to Hitlerism. We of the Communist Party, for our part, support such unity as the first law of political life, to which everything else must be subordinated.

There are people who call themselves anti-fascists and democrats, but who cry out that it is impossible for them to accept the co-operation of the Communists. Let us face the issue squarely, gentlemen! Do you really think it is possible to resist and defeat the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo axis without the co-operation of the Soviet Union? Do you really think you will be better off in such a struggle without the aid of 180 million people who are building a prosperous and powerful society on one-sixth of the earth? Of course, you do not; that is the sheerest nonsense..Do you then, when you accept Hitler's demand to exclude the Communists from your midst, apply it only to the small and weak Communist Party of the United States? But in that case, you are informed by the Dies Committee on Un-Americanism that the most dangerous Reds of all are none

other than President Roosevelt, Governor Murphy of Michigan, Next-Governor Olson of California, John L. Lewis and Shirley Temple.

The Communist Party has withdrawn most of its ticket from the ballot in New York, in the interests of defeating the reactionary Republican candidates and helping to bring about complete unity of all progressive and democratic forces around the labor-progressive candidates. We are putting forward one important candidate, Israel Amter, for Congressman-at-Large. We do this in the interests of the fight for complete progressive unity against the reactionaries. A large vote for Israel Amter will be a verdict for complete unity against fascism—and the only way at this moment to render such a verdict.

As we march to the polls to cast our ballots for progress and democracy, against reaction and fascism, let us remember the heroic peoples of Spain and China, who are conducting their part of this world-wide struggle on military battlefields at enormous costs of starvation and death. They are fighting our battle. If they lose, the war will be brought by the fascists to America. If they win, the victory is also ours. The least that we of the United States must do, is to use some of our enormous surplus wheat and cotton to feed and clothe Spain. The least we must do for China is to stop the shameful commerce of death by which we furnish Japan with more than half of its economic means of aggression, which is finally directed against America also—by an embargo on trade with Japan.

All together to defeat the reactionaries, agents of the economic royalists! All together, to win New York and the nation for a real New Deal, and for American leadership in the struggle for world peace!

Radio address delivered over station WMCA, New York, November 1, 1938.

PART THREE

THE FRUITS OF MUNICH

I

The Munich Betrayal

TONIGHT we are celebrating twenty-one years of the great socialist revolution, on that one-sixth of the earth—the Soviet Union.

The peoples of the Soviet Republics, demonstrating the swiftest and most profound progress in economy and culture ever witnessed in history, march forward to complete their classless socialist society. The rest of the world, where capitalism still rules, lives in the nightmare of crisis, one-fourth of the world already plunged into the bloody chaos of the new imperialist war, all the rest in feverish fear.

The fascist brigands of the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo axis are rushing the capitalist world toward destruction. The ruling circles of the British and French bourgeoisie, abandoning all pretense of resistance, entered into alliance with fascism in the infamous Munich Pact. In the United States, the reactionary camp whose spokesman is Herbert Hoover has joined hands with the Munich gang.

Among all the nations of the world, only the Soviet Union stood firm and unwavering in the midst of the chaos, confusion and disintegration of the capitalist world. It alone stood firmly by its pledges and obligations on the side of world order and peace. And within the other nations, only the Communist Parties, steeled in the teachings of Lenin and Stalin, stood in monolithic opposition to the betrayal of Munich, while all others wavered, split, surrendered or even went over to the fascist side.

It is against this world background that the Soviet Union, on its twenty-first anniversary, stands out in heroic grandeur. It is in this setting that we in the United States should study

the lessons of the land of socialism, for the better solution of our own most pressing problems.

The Munich Pact was treacherous betrayal of the republic of Czechoslovakia. But it was also far more than that. It opened the flood-gates of reaction over Europe. It placed the fascist noose around the neck of the French people. It strengthened the arrogant Japanese aggression in the Far East. It threatens new blows against the heroic Spanish people. It restored the shaking power of Hitler and Mussolini over their own enslaved peoples. It delivered a shattering blow at the remaining fabric of world peace. It threatens the encirclement of the United States, while it works to undermine our remaining democracy from within.

The Munich betrayal was presented to the world as a great achievement of peace. But the unanswerable stamp of falsehood was engraved upon this unprecedented cynicism by the immediate decision of all governments to multiply their armaments as the first consequence of Munich.

Was it inevitable that the world should suffer from the plagues unloosed upon it by the Pact of Munich? No, it was not inevitable!

Was the democratic and peace-loving world confronted at Munich by overwhelming forces, before which it had no choice but to surrender? No, that is a brazen and cynical lie!

Was it possible to save Czechoslovakia and also to preserve peace? Yes, it was clearly and demonstrably possible!

Hitler Germany was unprepared for war. It lacked raw materials, food, finances. Its fortifications were incomplete. Its army was without sufficient trained men. Its very General Staff was in revolt against the idea of war at this time. The German people were stirring with revolt which threatened, in event of war, to overthrow the whole fascist regime.

Against Hitler was concentrated an overwhelming preponderance of forces, military, economic and moral, which abso-

lutely guaranteed his quick defeat. In the face of these forces, firmly united, Hitler would have had no choice but to retreat.

No one knew this fact better than Chamberlain and Daladier and the circles for whom they acted. They did not surrender because they were afraid of a victory for Hitler. They were above all afraid of a defeat for Hitler. They joined forces with Hitler precisely in order to guarantee his victory. They wanted above all to preserve Hitler, as a policeman against their own as well as against the German people. They preferred to betray peace and democracy, rather than preserve it in co-operation with the Soviet Union. They betrayed the national interests of their own lands, rather than protect these interests in an international peace front that included the Soviet Union.

Hitler was bold, not because he was strong, but because he had received in advance the assurance that Chamberlain and Daladier would break up and betray the front of the democratic peoples. All the fantastic negotiations, with the military and naval mobilizations, were but elaborate stage-settings, in order to present the greatest treason of history as an achievement of peace!

So monstrous was this treason, that neither Chamberlain nor Daladier dared to ask even their own Cabinets for their agreement until after Czechoslovakia had already surrendered under their threats. While the Cabinets were still officially on record in support of Czechoslovakia, Chamberlain and Daladier sent emissaries to rouse President Benes from his bed at two a.m. with an ultimatum, either he must surrender to Hitler within a few hours or else both England and France would also join Hitler and assist him in subjugating Czechoslovakia. President Benes sent a hurried telegram to his Ambassador in Paris, asking if this was really the decision of the French government, suspecting the truth that it really was not. He did not receive any answer to his inquiry, for the simple reason that M. Daladier and M. Bonnet had held up all telegrams from Prague,

cutting Benes off from all communication with even his own Ambassadors until he would surrender. After Benes surrendered, then the French Cabinet was allowed to vote on the question, and meekly endorsed the murder when confronted with the corpse.

Today everyone understands that the Munich Pact enormously worsened the conditions for world peace. But not everyone yet realizes that it brought the threat of fascism and war with tenfold imminence to the United States. Czechoslovakia was the front line defense also of our country. When it was betrayed, America's peace was also betrayed.

Chamberlain boasted as his greatest achievement his separate agreement with Hitler. But what was the meaning of that for the U.S.? It means that the British Navy is neutralized in the face of Hitler's plan for conquest of Latin-America, unless it means something much worse, that Chamberlain will work out a plan of active collaboration with Hitler. At one stroke the Atlantic Ocean is transformed into a broad highway for fascist aggression. It is already on the agenda, that the Munich Powers will politely ask the United States to take its place as an attachment to the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo axis.

The almost unanimous will of the American people is to resist the fascist conquest of the world. President Roosevelt has expressed that will, and there is no reason to doubt its sincerity. But there are the gravest reasons to doubt the effectiveness of all means adopted so far to realize it. Good intentions are no substitute for an active world policy, nor is naval and military expansion. Of what avail to double the navy, when we help Hitler to cancel its effect by aiding his attempt to conquer Spain, to gain naval bases on the west of Africa, when we provide Japan with the means to dismember China? What avails the utmost armaments, when we meekly follow Hitler's instructions to disrupt the peace forces of the world by refusing effec-

tive co-operation with the Soviet Union to organize world peace?

Fascism is spreading its plague, because many leaders of the capitalist democracies, and reactionary leaders of the Socialist and Labor International prefer to retreat and surrender rather than accept the proffered help of the Soviet Union.

There can be no serious proposal to resist fascist world conquest that does not include the active co-operation of the Soviet Union.

The United States and the Soviet Union, Washington and Moscow, have it in their power, by acting together, to organize the peace-loving peoples of the world to smash once and for all the threat of the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo axis. It will not require an army of Americans to march into Berlin to do the job; the German people themselves will do all the fighting that is necessary in Berlin, once they know that the peoples of the U.S.A. with the U.S.S.R. have seriously taken up the task to organize the world to help them and halt their sadistic madmen rulers. It is true that we cannot trust the Daladier government of France for the slightest co-operation. But given a lead in the co-operation of the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R., the French people would quickly raise a government truly representative of the *Front Populaire* which we could trust.

It is true that we cannot trust the Chamberlain government in Britain for anything, steeped as it is in treason and betrayal. But given a lead from the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R., the British people would quickly raise to power a government of the peace-coalition of all labor, liberal and progressive forces, which we could trust.

The agents of fascism among us cry out desperately against such a proposal, using the most fantastic arguments. Let us briefly examine them, for thereby we find the best arguments on the other side.

The reactionaries openly speculate that the Soviet Union

may try to beat Chamberlain at his own game by joining hands with Hitler. But even those who hate the land of socialism cannot believe it, when they see the Soviet Union alone rounds up the traitorous agents of Hitler within its own land, and puts them beyond all possibility of doing any more of their wrecking, spying and diversions for fascism. The clean-up of the Trotskyite-Bukharinite-Lovestoneite gangs in the Soviet Union was the final guarantee, for those who needed it, that the Soviet Union will never be surrendered to fascism.

Now the agents of fascism are complaining that the Soviet Union is really very weak, and cannot be depended upon to withstand a serious attack by Hitler. Therefore, they argue, don't depend upon the Soviet Union. They even trotted out Charles Lindbergh to testify how weak is the Soviet air force and how mighty is Hitler's. But think it over for a moment, even those of you who refuse to believe the contrary evidence of Communists and friends of the Soviet Union. If it were true that the Soviet Union is weak, perhaps the news might reach Adolph Hitler. And if Hitler heard it—and believed it—he might be tempted to seize those broad rich Ukrainian wheat fields, the thought of which has obsessed him for so many years. Hitler has always moved first against the points of least resistance; today he is much more busy in Latin America than in preparing to cross the Ukrainian border much closer at hand. Can it be that Hitler has also heard about Soviet weakness? If so, his actions prove that he, at least, does not believe these fairy tales. No, Hitler knows that once he crosses the Soviet border he has engaged in a struggle the outcome of which he seriously doubts. There could be no more conclusive testimony than this to the strength of the Red Army, Navy and Air Fleet, and of the socialist economy and culture which it defends.

What remains of the reactionary arguments against collaboration with the Soviet Union? Their big card is the Dies Committee canard, that the Soviet Union is trying to foment

revolution within the U.S., preparing to overthrow our democratic institutions. But this is a lie out of whole cloth, which even the most conservative American citizen need not be disturbed by. The Soviet Union relies entirely for its influence in bringing socialism to the rest of the world upon the effectiveness of its own example of what socialism means for the people. Since our most conservative citizens are deeply convinced that American capitalism is much better than socialism, then they cannot believe that the example of the Soviet Union will be very convincing. If they really believe in capitalism as they say, they should be the first to laugh the Dies Committee out of existence. And surely such a far-fetched charge could not be sufficient reason to refuse the co-operation of a great power, one of the strongest in the world, in preserving world peace.

As for the Communists in the U.S., we believe that socialism is the better system; we believe that the example of socialism in the U.S.S.R. will finally convince the entire world to follow a similar path. We are so firmly convinced of this fact, far from being impatient to force socialism upon an unwilling people, we pledge our firm support to maintain the will of the majority of the people, democratically ascertained; and so long as this majority will is to maintain the present system, we submit ourselves to that decision. We do this all the more willingly, since we know that the building of socialism is a difficult task which requires the free co-operation of the overwhelming majority of the people, something which cannot be forced but can only come from deep conviction.

But socialism or Communism is not being forced upon the world anywhere. The Soviet Union has never uttered an aggressive word against any of its neighbors, not to mention that in its whole twenty-one years it has never committed an aggressive act. There is no people anywhere which has any fear, or any reason to fear, aggression from the Soviet Union. On the contrary, there is no government which has more scrupulously

respected its international agreements, or which is more ready to maintain by all means international order and peace.

Nor is the issue of socialism or Communism being forced upon an unwilling public by the Communist Party of the U.S.A. We openly proclaim that we subordinate our own special program for the reorganization of society to the will of the majority of democratic and progressive people, and devote all our energies to realize the will of the majority, to defend democracy at all costs.

The majority of the people, the workers, farmers and city middle classes, want to maintain democracy, a rising standard of living, and peace. Above all, they want to halt the march of Hitler toward conquest of the world. They want guarantees that no Hitler shall come to power in the United States. They want a world in which a democratic America can freely develop without fear of aggression.

But all these things are in danger, they are threatened, from abroad and from within. Powerful minorities, the reactionaries with monopoly capital supporting them, are dragging America with the rest of the world toward fascism and war.

That is the real and pressing danger, because the majority of the people are not strongly organized as yet, their unity is threatened by demagogy, false issues, race prejudice and the thousand pressures of the reactionaries who control the industries, the press and much of our social and political institutions.

The big problem of the day is to firmly weld the unity of the progressive majority of the people in a single democratic front, to maintain our advances and to cancel the gains of reaction in the elections which resulted from insufficient unity.

The working class is the largest section of the people in the United States, and only a united working class can strengthen and extend the united front of the people against reaction, fascism and war.

Working-class unity, unity within each industry, unity on

a national scale, international unity—this is the need of the hour, without which all human values are threatened with destruction.

The enemies of unity must be identified, isolated and defeated. There are some trade union leaders at the head of the A. F. of L. who for their own selfish or reactionary reasons deliberately maneuver to maintain and extend the divisions between the parts of the labor movement. There are those Socialist Party leaders who openly boast of their splitting activities which bring victories to the worst reactionaries. There are the little groups of fascist agents, the Trotskyites and Lovestoneites, whose intrigues, provocations and disruptions have but one aim, to break up the unity of the workers and of the democratic front. One and all, their influence among the masses must be broken by systematically exposing their crimes against unity of the people and the working class. Without a daily and resolute struggle against these agents of the enemy, it is impossible to bring unity, and therefore impossible to defeat fascism and war.

The heroic Spanish people have shown how to weld unity, even in the midst of a bloody war of fascist invasion, and how fascism can be halted by that unity, even against overwhelming odds.

The glorious Chinese people have shown how to weld unity, even under the blows of invasion of the most modern military machine and when deserted by almost all their friends.

Only the Soviet Union has remained true to its obligations to help its neighbors when they are set upon by thieves and robbers. Only the Soviet Union has consistently helped the Spanish and Chinese peoples, to the extent of its abilities, to resist the aggressors. Thereby the Soviet Union has given the highest service to peace and democracy, and to the interests of the American people also.

It is to the eternal shame of the United States that we per-

mitted ourselves to be tricked into helping Hitler and Mussolini invade Spain by our outrageous embargo against the Spanish republic. From thus sowing the wind in Spain, we are now about to reap the whirlwind of fascism in Latin America. Let the voice of the majority of Americans be raised together, in our own national interest as well as that of all progressive mankind, to demand: Lift the embargo from the Spanish republic! American food surplus to feed the Spanish people! An embargo against Hitler Germany.

It is a criminal stupidity, which almost seems to justify the fascist contempt for democracy, that the United States has furnished and continues to furnish the economic means whereby Japan makes war on China and closes the door of that great continent to America. If democracy is to survive, it must abandon such stupidity. The boycott of Japanese goods must be made one hundred per cent! Stop all trade with Japan!

In a world dark with crisis, reaction, fascism and war, the one flaming beacon light is the Soviet Union. Its socialist industry already towers above all other lands except the United States. Its collective agriculture leads the world in production, and spreads well-being over the countryside. It is the only spot on the globe where material progress and cultural advance proceed steadily and embrace the great mass of the people. It is the only land that has no internal fascist menace. It is the only nation in which national unity is a reality, in which class divisions and exploitation no longer divide mankind. It is the one land of opportunity and happiness for the youth and equality for women. It is the only country where the brotherhood of man has ceased to be merely an aspiration and become a living reality, where more than a hundred nationalities live in peace and fraternity. These history-making achievements are the product of the leadership of the Party of Lenin and Stalin.

We in America, in our own small way, are building the same

kind of a Party in the Communist Party of the United States, and in the Young Communist League. And small as we still are, the enemies of the people have already felt the force of the political blows of our policy and cry out against us; while our friends have learned not only to trust our good intentions, but have learned that we are essential factors in achieving the common victory. Approaching the 100,000 mark in Party membership, we are inviting into our ranks now that additional 100,000 men and women already about us, who believe in and support our work, and only need their Party card to be full-fledged disciples of Lenin and Stalin.

Last week, on November 7, the deep and strong friendship of the American people for the peoples of the Soviet Union was appropriately expressed in a message of greetings to the President of the Soviet Union from the President of the United States.

That friendship must ripen into an active collaboration to halt the advance of fascism, and to preserve democracy and peace.

In this common task is united the interests of the American people together with that of the peoples of all lands. In this task is the interests of the working class of the world.

Address delivered on the 21st Anniversary of the Russian Revolution, at Madison Square Garden, November 14, 1938.

II

America Must Answer the Nazi Pogroms

ALL THE WORLD is filled with horror at the events of the last few days in Hitler's realm. The Dark Ages from which is drawn this social plague furnish no parallel to the mad fury of anti-Semitic pogroms deliberately unloosed and organized over Germany. A spontaneous cry of outraged protest has come from the people of the United States. It is intolerable that such wholesale offense against human decency can be perpetrated anywhere. Human dignity cannot exist anywhere in the world, in face of these crimes, except through unequivocal and emphatic condemnation expressed not only in words but also in deeds. Every American who clings to our best traditions must have felt a thrill of gratification that Washington responded by a deed, more eloquent than any words, in the withdrawal from Berlin of the American Ambassador.

The horrible events now going on in Nazi Germany are but a part of the fruits of the Munich Pact. That agreement for the enthronement of organized banditry over Europe opened the flood-gates of reaction over the world.

Every person who fails to raise his voice against the Nazi pogroms, by that fact becomes a partner in crime with Hitler. And every person who accepts or condones the Munich Pact undertakes the same responsibility.

The broadest united front of all the forces of decency and progress must be formed to impress upon the Nazi butchers, in the only language they can understand, that the world is united against them, determined to halt once and for all the spread of their poison over the face of the earth. Humanity can no longer live in the stifling atmosphere produced by a Hitler.

In the hot indignation that sweeps over America against the crimes in Germany, let us not overlook the growing and alarming signs of the growth of Hitlerism within the United States itself. Anti-Semitism is the infallible sign of desperate reactionary forces at work, threatening civilization, wherever it appears and under whatever forms.

It is being spread wholesale in the United States today. It seeps through our social structure in whispers and innuendoes. It is openly expressed in meetings, in the press, on the radio. It played a vicious role in the election campaign just concluded. It is subsidized with millions of dollars by some of our economic royalists. It has a sanctified spokesman in the radio priest, Father Coughlin. It is preparing for America some shameful pages similar to those now disgracing Germany, if it is not scotched in its infancy by an awakened and outraged people.

For the attention of our Catholic brothers and fellow-citizens, who still tolerate the anti-Semitic and fascist ravings of Father Coughlin, we point out the lesson of Germany, that anti-Semitism and anti-Catholicism are Siamese twins that always go together. Pogroms against the Jews in Germany are accompanied by the sacking of Catholic sanctuaries and the murder of Catholic leaders. The same close connection between the two obscurantist cults is clearly visible in the United States, where it is also closely linked up with a revival of the hateful anti-Negro cult, remnant of the slavery we abolished long ago under the leadership of Abraham Lincoln. And Hitler has shown us that what begins as a "crusade against Communism" always and inevitably ends up as a smashing of the labor movement, the destruction of democracy, the crushing of religious freedom for Catholics and Protestants alike, and culminates in such historic crimes as those now going on against the Jews in Germany.

All these reactionary and divisive propagandas, anti-social and criminal, are being wielded in our own country by those

dark forces which would drag America onto the road of fascism. All of America that would save our country from the fate of Hitlerism must unite to drive these criminal cults out of public life, and to clear them out of even the darkest corners.

Do not allow confused and false leaders to lead you to place the blame for the current atrocities upon the German people. The great and cultured nation that produced Goethe, Heine, Marx, Humboldt and a thousand other brilliant figures who gave their full contribution to lifting humanity to newer heights—that nation is not responsible for the miserable typhus-lice of the Hitlers, the Goebbels and the Goerings, who have infected Germany and threaten the whole world with such dire sickness. The German people were betrayed into the hands of fascism by the false and traitorous representatives of monopoly capital all over the world. During last September the German people were preparing to rise up and crush these lice upon their body, but they were thrust down again by the brutal hands of Chamberlain and Daladier, who rushed to Munich to press into the hands of Hitler the weapons for re-establishing his power over Germany and spreading it to new regions of the world.

No, the German people are our best and most important allies; they are awaiting the work of co-operation from us, to do their bit. To scotch the snake of Hitlerism, there is no necessity for armies of American boys to march into Berlin. If any fighting is required there to end the Brown Shirt plague, the German people can be relied upon to do the job thoroughly—once they are sure that America is ready to guarantee them against a new betrayal.

It is necessary to organize the world for a great social and political health campaign, to cleanse the earth of the typhus of fascism. The United States must lead the world in this task. We who have the most to lose, must assume the most responsi-

ble role. We will find willing and enthusiastic helpers all over the world.

It is true that we cannot trust the Daladier government of France for the slightest co-operation. But given a clear and strong lead from the United States, the people of France will quickly raise up a government which we can trust.

It is true that we cannot trust the Chamberlain government of Britain for anything, steeped as it is in treason and betrayal. But given a lead from the United States, the British people will quickly raise to power a government of the peace coalition of all labor, liberal and progressive forces, which we could trust, and which could restore the now-missing prefix of Great to Britain.

And we can absolutely depend upon the collaboration of the greatest power in the world outside the United States—that is, the Soviet Union.

It is one of the brightest achievements of the Soviet Union that, inheriting a land where anti-Semitism had been fostered for generations by the Czarist government, it not only outlawed by its Constitution and its Criminal Code the sadistic cult of anti-Semitism and race-prejudice (so far the only nation in the world that has done so), but it has done more, it has effectively wiped out this plague as an influence upon public life and among the masses.

The Soviet Union has proved beyond all doubt that it remains true to its obligations, to its treaties, to its responsibilities as a good neighbor in the community of nations. It has never committed an act of aggression, nor broken a treaty. It unwaveringly supported Ethiopia. It remains the one active friend of China. It alone refused to abandon the Spanish republic. It stood from beginning to end in solid support of Czechoslovakia. What other nation in the world can claim a similar record?

Let us be clear, that if we want to halt the fascist atrocities in Germany, if we want to prevent its spread over the world to finally engulf America, we must be prepared to co-operate with all peace-loving peoples and with all governments that can be trusted to keep their word, including the Soviet Union.

And let us further be clear, that we must end once and for all such criminal stupidity as our present attitude to China and Japan, in which we criticize Japan's aggression but continue to furnish more than half of all the economic means whereby it is perpetrated. If democracy is so stupid as to continue to furnish weapons to its active executioners, then democracy will surely die. And such stupidity deserves to die.

If we want to preserve Latin America from Hitler, whose plans place that continent next on the list of aggressions, then we must awake to the fact that Spain is the first line of defense of Latin America. We must lift the shameful embargo against the Spanish republic, an embargo which violates our treaty obligations, and which betrays the American national interest as well, making us in effect allies of Hitler.

Instead of helping the aggressors and blockading their victims, we must do the opposite. We must help Spain and China, by opening our markets and by sending them our surplus foods; we must place a strict embargo on all trade with Germany and Japan, until they halt their atrocities and aggressions.

The shameful pogroms against the Jews in Germany has finally awakened the sleeping conscience of America. But now that we are awake, let us see fully the whole situation of the world around us. The world is in deadly peril. We have contributed to that peril by our stupidity and complacence and inactivity. We have a unique opportunity. America holds half the wealth and potential power of all the world. Four-fifths of the rest of the world waits for our leadership. We have world destiny in our hands. We can decide whether the world shall

slip down in chaos and destruction, or whether it will be organized for human progress and decency.

Let all decent Americans unite to solve this question in the high tradition transmitted to us by our great forebears Jefferson and Lincoln.

Radio speech over station WMCA, New York, November 16, 1938.

III

Questions and Answers

Q. *What, in your opinion, is the reason for Hitler's latest atrocities against Jews and Catholics, and how should America answer these pogroms?*

A. The Nazi pogroms are among the direct results of the Munich Pact which opened the flood-gates of reaction over Europe and the world. After Chamberlain and Daladier enthroned Hitler over Europe, saving him from a threatening collapse, all the innate vicious criminality of fascism was given free play. America's answer must be made with the understanding that these pogroms are not only an offense to human decency, but represent a threat to the national interests of the United States. They are directly connected with the Chamberlain plans for a "Munich" settlement for Spain. A Republican Spain is a bulwark against fascist penetration of Latin America. But a Franco Spain, puppet of Hitler and Mussolini, is one of the keys to fascist conquest of our Southern neighbors, and the encirclement of the United States, particularly since the Munich Pact has neutralized the British navy. Our president, to the applause of the entire country, gave the first part of the only kind of answer that Hitler can understand, when he withdrew the American Ambassador from Berlin. A next step that seems logically called for, is to apply existing legislation to counter Hitler's economic warfare against us by an embargo, which should be applied also to the Far Eastern end of the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo axis, stopping our shameful help to the Japanese crimes in China. American surplus foods to feed Republican Spain would do much to halt Hitler's drive in Latin America and also help solve a domestic

problem. And United States policy at the Lima Conference clearly should be directed toward setting up an impregnable wall against Nazi aggressions in the Western hemisphere. That, briefly, seems the immediate minimum called for by the national interests of the United States, as well as by all considerations of decency and human solidarity. Of course, our country should assume its full responsibility to meet the emergency of caring for the refugees from the Nazi horrors.

Q. *What do you consider to be the significance of the Lima Conference of nations in the Western hemisphere?*

A. The chief significance of the Lima Conference will be its demonstration of solidarity of the Americas against fascist aggression. To achieve this end fully, it needs to demonstrate a further unfolding of the "Good Neighbor Policy" of President Roosevelt, in contrast with past examples of bad neighborliness which left suspicions of "Yankee imperialism," that Hitler manipulates to his advantage. We need have no illusions about the democratic character of many Latin-American governments (including that of Peru itself), but even so a Pan-American front against the Munich Powers and Japan is the first condition needed for raising Pan-American democracy to a higher and more effective level. The United States has the opportunity to give leadership, primarily to the peoples of the Americas, but also to the peoples of the whole world. World fascism is advancing only because the world democracies have been retreating; and the democracies are retreating because the United States, representing half the potential power of the world, has not taken a decisive stand to organize the world against the war-makers. Lima can become the starting point of such a positive peace policy, with the United States finally assuming her proper responsibilities. I believe that all Americans should support every step in such a direction. Let us hope that Lima will be fruitful in this sense.

Q. *What effect has the persecution of minorities abroad upon the position of the Jews, Catholics and Negro people in the United States?*

A. As I see it, the effect is two-sided. On the one hand, Hitler's medieval policies, enormously intensified over anything seen in the past, has stimulated similar forces in the United States, which are reviving on a large scale the old and shameful traditions of Know-nothingism, the American Protective Association, and the Ku Klux Klan, of anti-Negro, anti-Catholic and anti-Semitic agitations, which are more widespread and more poisonous than ever. But at the same time, world events are awakening the people of the United States to the danger of these obscurantist and reactionary cults to the very existence of American democracy. When fascist spokesmen abroad are able to point out these reactionary forces within the United States, and claim them as their own blood brothers and allies, then it is much easier to arouse the conscience of America against these abuses. Thus the advancement of Negro rights, to bring the benefits of our Constitution to the fifteen million Negro Americans at long last, becomes a more practical task for the whole nation. The recent Conference for Human Rights in the South is a sign of this national awakening. And of course Congressman Martin Dies has found a "Communist conspiracy" in that Conference, as he has found in the whole New Deal, following the formula of the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo axis, which calls itself the "Anti-Communist Alliance." We Communists appreciate the compliment, when Mr. Dies gives us credit for everything progressive in our country, but modesty and truth compel us to disclaim the laurels. There are millions of progressive Americans; in fact they constitute a majority, while we Communists are still a very small minority indeed, and are effective today in our country's political life only because we staunchly support every sign of progress that we find anywhere, whatever its political label.

Q. *Do you agree with the estimate of the press that the recent elections indicated a repudiation of the New Deal and a conservative trend in American politics?*

A. No, I cannot agree with the newspaper and Republican interpretation of the election results. Of course, it would be foolish to deny that the reactionary camp gained new positions of power, and dangerously strengthened themselves. But they accomplished this by a flank attack, avoiding in most cases any head-on collision with the New Deal. Wherever this main issue was clear, the progressive forces won a decisive victory. But when we see that most of the reactionaries won by promising all things to all men, the Townsend Plan with its 24 billion dollar annual budget, simultaneously with decreased taxes and a balanced budget, then the reactionary victory reveals not a reactionary trend among the people, but the contrary, a demand for further advance, which is manipulated by Republican demagogy. But the reactionary demagogues are sowing the wind, and the crop may well be a whirlwind, if they are successful, which will be unpleasant for conservatives and liberals alike. The hope for orderly progress in America is the exposure and defeat of the threatening alliance of reactionary demagogy with the crack-pot lunatic fringe of the people's movement for social security and democratic progress.

Q. *What do the election results reveal of the strength and influence of the Communist Party in our country's political life?*

A. The Communist Party showed a growing influence, although still that of a distinctly small fraction of the population. Our growing vote is based upon our loyal and very practical support to all other progressive political trends without distinction of party label. We Communists helped to build the united progressive and democratic front everywhere, and collaborated with Republicans as well as Democrats and third-party and labor groupings, wherever there was any possibility

of a broad unity of all forward-looking people against the reactionary camp. We are learning how to take our place within the traditional American two-party system, which seems to have much vitality yet, even though the real two parties now cut across all the old party labels, and can be more realistically identified as the New Deal Party and the Anti-New Deal Party. The Communist Party has no illusions that our country is prepared to vote upon our ultimate program for the socialist reorganization of the United States. Only the reactionary forces push forward the issue of Communism or socialism, which they wish to represent as identical with the New Deal. We of the Communist Party declare that not socialism or Communism is the issue today, but the real and burning issue is whether the majority of the people can unite in time to save democracy, progress, and peace, from the advancing threat of reactionary dictatorship, which will drag America to fascism and war. And our Party is growing because it demonstrates that it is one hundred per cent on the side of the majority of the people.

Radio interview over Station WOL, Washington, D.C., November 27, 1938.

IV

Social and National Security

Nazi pogroms against the Jews, and their violent assaults against the Catholics, have awakened the American people, more than anything else, to the world significance of the Munich conspiracy. The tremendous all-embracing sweep of the protest movement against the pogroms lit up the world scene for the people of the United States; in its light there stood out the need for a new evaluation of the betrayal of Czechoslovakia. That last democracy of Central Europe is now seen to have been a front-line trench in the defense of world peace. Its betrayal is seen as the betrayal of peace and democracy all over the world, including the United States.

Against the background of Munich our people now begin to understand the new Japanese aggressions, and the insolent Japanese demand that the United States accept its closed door in the Far East. Chamberlain's boasted "peace pact" with Hitler is seen in its true light as the removal of the British fleet as an obstacle to Hitler's plans for conquest of Latin America. The Munich Pact, unloosing the floodgates of reaction over Europe, strengthening Japanese aggression in China, threatening Latin America with large-scale fascist penetration, moving through the Empire ties to bring Canada into its orbit, clearly envisages the encirclement of the United States by the new coalition of the fascist powers with the imperialist ruling circles of Britain and France.

Clearly the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo axis is now an enormously multiplied menace to democracy and peace, and especially to the United States, since Chamberlain has allied with it and

brought into the combination the new dictatorship which Daladier is proposing to establish over the French people.

Projects for a new "Munich" settlement for Spain now being hatched in Paris by Chamberlain and Halifax, in conjunction with Daladier and Bonnet, according to the dictates of Hitler and Mussolini, thus strike clearly against Latin America in the first place; they constitute a dagger at the heart of American security against the fascist madness flooding Europe, Africa and Asia.

The political face of the world has been transformed by the Munich Pact. Every problem and every international relationship must be re-examined in the light of the new situation.

The Munich surrender was not inevitable; both Czechoslovakia and peace could have been saved.

Before Munich both Hitler and Mussolini were tottering on the edge of the abyss. Fascist economy was strained to the breaking-point; the middle classes, being wiped out by the crisis, were moving toward common action with the oppressed working masses; the army itself was on the point of revolt; the very apparatus of fascist power was torn with increasing conflicts. All that was necessary to halt the fascist advance was a firm and unyielding front of the democratic powers of the West standing with the Soviet Union—that unshakable fortress against fascism in both Europe and Asia. Such a firm front, demonstrated as possible, would have guaranteed not only the halt of Hitler, but the quick destruction of fascism as a threat to world peace.

After Munich the fascists have their shaking powers again propped up. The front of the anti-fascist peoples has been broken through, fascism has won new positions from which to launch a wider offensive, and the fascist attacks are more insolent than ever: the fascist dictatorships have been strengthened against their own people, the fascist front has been united and

extended for a new series of aggressions that embrace all continents.

The direct lie was given to all protestations that the Munich Pact was an achievement for peace when, directly afterward, all governments announced vast expansions of their armed forces as their first response.

The full depths of the Munich treason were revealed when, with startling speed, it was followed by the most insolent, bestial, bloodthirsty, indecent assaults upon the rest of the world by all the most reactionary forces.

Fascism, reaction and war are advancing against the whole world as the result of the Munich betrayal.

Against this menace there is a rising movement of the working class and of the peoples to oppose the Munich treason and its consequences.

In this world movement, there stand out before the peace-loving peoples of all the world two centers of resistance to the fascist flood, two points from which leadership and inspiration can be given to the majority of mankind struggling for democracy and peace, two rallying grounds for the hard-pressed forces of progress and culture—the Soviet Union and the United States.

Today, as never before, the fate of the world depends upon the role that will be played by these two greatest powers in the world; more than ever, this *depends upon the collaboration of these two powers for their common aims.*

The Soviet Union and the United States have common problems, common interests and common enemies.

This is a central fact in the new world situation.

Upon this foundation it is necessary to find a *program of collaboration* which can effectively unite these two greatest world powers, a program based upon the full recognition of the national interests of all peoples, and uniting them in a *minimum international policy* required for their orderly pro-

tection, as these interests are understood today by the preponderance of opinion of the co-operating peoples.

This is the key to the struggle for world peace, and to prevent the spread of the already developing world war.

Can we realistically pose this co-operation as something that can be achieved?

The consequences of the Munich Pact force this question to the front, demanding an immediate answer. The answer cannot any longer be postponed.

So far as the Soviet Union is concerned, the answer is easy to give with full assurance. The Soviet Union, firm and calm in a world of storms, confident in its own strength, has never wavered from its oft-expressed policy of full co-operation with all peoples and governments which, from whatever motives, oppose aggression and uphold orderly international relations. The Soviet Union is one government which has not a single record of breaking an agreement or violating an accepted responsibility.

If there were any persons who listened to the fascist-inspired whispers that the Soviet Union was itself likely to be swung to the side of the Munich Powers, their answer is to be found in the thorough house-cleaning which swept all the spies, wreckers and diversionist agents of the fascist powers into the waste-basket of history. If any listened to the fairy tales spread by Hitler's messenger boy, Lindbergh, that the Soviet Union cannot be trusted because it is weak, they can find their answer in the pathetic eagerness of the Japanese militarists to settle the Changkufeng "incident" last summer on the formula given by the Soviet Union, and in the obvious fact that Hitler (who loves nothing better than a weak enemy) moves in any and all directions rather than across the Soviet border, and even reserves his most unbridled insolences for the British and American peoples.

Yes, we can state with complete assurance: the Soviet Union

is not only willing but is fully able, in every respect, to give that unwavering collaboration of a great power which is the supreme need of the United States as it rides into the storm of the world crisis.

Can the United States be depended upon for such collaboration for world peace? To this the answer is more difficult, because the United States is not yet united and of one mind....

The progressive or liberal camp receives its supreme test on these questions; it is on this field that Herbert Hoover, championing the Munich Powers and proposing a "Chamberlain" policy for the United States, leads the reactionary camp in what they hope will be the crucial issue to break up the progressive majority of the people.

In order to defend even its own narrowed national interests, the United States must assume a leading role in organizing all the peace forces of the world. That is the key to the unfolding of a really democratic and progressive foreign policy for the United States. The Rome-Berlin-Tokyo powers driving toward world conquest, with Chamberlain and Daladier already in their orbit, are obviously and swiftly moving to the encirclement of the United States and the conquest of Latin America. There can be no serious defense of the national interests of the United States that is not planned on a world scale, utilizing all present and potential allies, and organizing them for joint resistance to fascism and, immediately, help to Spain and China.

This leading thought for an active foreign policy is one of the first necessities of the platform for building the democratic front looking to the 1940 elections....

We are an American Party, composed of American citizens. We view all our problems in the light of the national interests of the United States. The national interests are not the interests of the pro-fascist circles of monopoly capital, of imperi-

alism; they are the interests of the great majority of the people, the workers, the farmers and the toiling middle classes, whose labor and efforts and sacrifices have formed our nation and built it into the richest and technically most advanced in the world. Our national interests harmonize with those of all other peoples in the world, and clash only with fascist governments and those which capitulate or surrender to fascism. Therefore the national interests of Americans go in the direction of the internationalism of the most advanced thought of mankind.

In the current issue of *The Communist* * is an article in which I discuss some aspects of this question of the relation of our nation to internationalism. For the sake of saving time, I ask you to consider this article a part of my report, and proceed to consideration of some practical problems.

As an immediate result of the Munich Pact, every important government in the world, including our own, has announced big expansions of the armed forces. Armaments constitute a central question of the day. What must be our attitude toward it?

Prior to the Munich Pact, we declared that a correct peace policy by the United States, which would organize the overwhelmingly preponderant peace forces of the world, could quickly halt and remove the menace of fascist aggression without the necessity of a big armaments program for our country. We opposed the Naval Bill on those grounds, and because it became a substitute for a correct peace policy, and an obstacle to the adoption of the correct policy. Now, the failure of the United States to adopt and follow energetically the policy we proposed has borne its fruits in the Munich Pact. Munich enormously increased the fascist menace and brought it to the American continents in an immediate sense.

This argument on armament that was valid before Munich

* "Concerning American Revolutionary Traditions," *The Communist,* December, 1938.

loses its force afterward. Munich is an accomplished fact, with all its awful consequences. We can no longer dismiss the armaments question with the old answer. We cannot deny the possibility, even the probability, that only American arms can preserve the Americas from conquest by the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo alliance. The Munich betrayal shattered not only the possibility that relatively unarmed United States, by material and moral aid, could organize the rest of the peace-loving world to halt the fascist offensive, but also destroyed at one blow the sheltered position of the Americas. The Atlantic Ocean is transformed from a barrier to a broad high-road for the aggressor powers. The Pacific may soon be the same.

An unarmed people stands today as helpless victims for fascist conquest.

A fascist world can be prevented only, in the words of the Manifesto of the Communist International on November 7, "*with the aid of such governments which are ready to use armed force in the defense of the liberty and independence of their peoples.*" Only on this basis "*it will be possible for a firm front of the peoples to arise which will compel the fascist aggressors to respect frontiers and keep the peace.*"

It will be necessary to clear away all remnants of the pacifist rubbish of opposing war by surrender to the war-makers. Because for so many years the revolutionary working class consistently opposed, and correctly so, all appropriations for armaments and military establishments of all sorts, we inevitably were associated with the pacifist elements in some common actions, the peace-at-any-price individuals and groups who have today become Hitler's best allies. Some of their ideas seeped into and poisoned small circles of the labor movement for a time. The time has come to clear away all remnants of this degenerate influence.

Norman Thomas, in common with the most reactionary ideologists in the country, propagates a most vicious form of

this pacifist degeneracy, when he argues that a democracy is incapable of defending itself against aggression, that faced with war it must choose between surrender to the fascists without or the fascists within, that in the very effort to defend itself democracy is transformed into fascism. This pacifist defeatism was made to order for the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo alliance; if they could only persuade the rest of the world to agree with Norman Thomas, their job would be done.

Fortunately, the influence of Thomas and all his kind is rapidly melting away, instead of increasing, so there is still hope in the world. The fundamental instinct of democracy is toward peace, it abhors war, but when it must fight for its life it is more capable of sustained struggle than any reactionary dictatorship, struggle simultaneously against its enemies within and without, at home and abroad. That is the main lesson of our own nation's history, not to go further afield for historical examples. The War of Independence, 1776-1783, was not chosen by the American people, but when it was forced upon them, they founded the first great modern democracy as a result. Despite Norman Thomas' sneering remarks to discredit the United States in the War of 1812, and the national anthem that was born in it, that was another defensive war for the maintenance of democracy and national independence, without which American progress would have been stultified. American democracy did not choose the Civil War, but when it was forced by the slave-power, its outcome in victory for the North was a victory for freedom all over the world, while a surrender to the South would have been a crushing blow against progress here and everywhere. And, today, the Spanish and Chinese peoples are giving a remarkable demonstration of how democracy can expand and grow in the very fires of a just war for national independence. No, the arguments of Norman Thomas are a vicious falsification of the lessons of history, arguments

whose only practical conclusions are answers to the most fervent prayers of Hitler, Mussolini and the Mikado.

Our first conclusion must be, therefore, that in the world situation after Munich we cannot adopt a negative position to the question of armaments.

Neither can we, however, meet the new situation with a simple affirmative. No matter how much the situation has changed, it still remains true—more true than ever—that armaments are no substitute for a positive peace policy, for a correct approach and active role in organizing the world against the war-makers and therefore for peace. The question is not, Are we for armaments, yes or no; it is the more complicated question, "Armaments, for what?" If it is for the defense of the liberty and independence of our own and other peoples, Yes, emphatically yes! But the people must learn to make its "Yes" a power for securing guarantees that the armaments will be for that purpose and for no other.

Armaments in themselves provide no safeguard against fascist conquest. Spain had arms and an army, but it was precisely this army which was seized from within by the agents of the fascist invaders, and turned into the executioner of the Spanish people. Let us not too quickly congratulate ourselves in the United States that the same thing "can't happen here." It is only a few weeks since the Secretary of War of our own country found it necessary to note as "treasonable" the public utterances of an army general who had just retired from active service and begun to talk publicly for the first time. It would be very interesting to know how many of the general's brother officers agree with his treasonable views. But we have no way to find out. And the thought makes us very uneasy of increasing the powers of these officers. It is necessary to find democratic guarantees for our armed forces, if they are to be relied upon in meeting the fascist menace. It is necessary to cleanse

the armed forces and governmental apparatus of all fascist agents and sympathizers.

To stand up against the advancing fascist alliance, to call it to a halt, is a much bigger and more dangerous job after Munich than it would have been before. Perhaps there are persons who will raise the question: Is it worth while? Could we not, by following Chamberlain's policy, come to an acceptable bargain with the fascist powers?

Of course the great mass of the people, the workers, farmers and middle classes, cannot and will not even ask such questions. For them the issue is settled that they will resist fascism to the last breath. But some sections of our upper classes *are* asking themselves these questions, and seriously leaning toward surrender to foreign fascism, while the most reactionary circles still dream of a native American fascism. Even these gentlemen, however, should begin to understand that if Hitler's hordes once get their foothold in rich America, their voracious appetites will grow with the eating and with little delay they will come to have less respect for an American bourgeois than they now show for a Jewish doctor in Germany. It will do no good for the American bourgeoisie to plead with Hitler that they are good "Aryans"; the Nazis long ago learned to provide Jewish pedigrees for anyone who either resists them or holds any property they want to take; they have impartially presented both President Roosevelt and myself with Jewish family trees, and what they can do for us they can do also for a Rockefeller or a Morgan or even a Ford. For by that time they will be world conquerors.

It is the purest humanitarianism, therefore, to point out even to the American bourgeoisie that self-interest does not lie in accommodation to Hitler; accommodation must be followed by surrender, and it is not pleasant to visualize what would happen to soft and flabby American millionaires when they are at the mercy of Hitler's gang of hardened cutthroats. But then, I'm

afraid that American upper-income groups have an invincible prejudice against accepting advice from the Communists, so there is very little we can do for them directly, except to do everything we can to guarantee that the United States will not go their road, but rather the democratic and anti-fascist road of the majority of the people.

When the United States has thoroughly made up its mind to stand out against the fascist alliance, the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo axis and its Chamberlain-Daladier annex, then the question is, how to do a quick and thorough job of it. Do we want to do it alone, or do we want all the help we can get?

The simplest kind of common sense seems to require that the American people gather all the assistance possible. Most people will agree to that.

Who will be willing to stand with the United States?

Following the steps of thought of American spokesmen of the day, we turn first to the Americas. The Lima Conference that opens soon is openly discussed as the first step to organize the Americas against the fascist invasion. Good, so far as it goes, and every anti-fascist must wish the conference well. But we must warn that it will not go very far unless a few points of policy are thoroughly established: (1) that every trace of the old "Dollar Diplomacy," of the old "Yankee Imperialism," be washed out of the "Good Neighbor Policy" which Roosevelt has been developing; (2) that we do not forget that we need *unity of the American democracies,* while in many Latin-American countries the *democracies* are suppressed and their leaders in jail or exile, which is the main reason for Hitler's successes there; (3) that the United States diplomatic and consular staff in Latin America, which is the instrument for executing United States policy in practice, shall be cleansed of its fascist sympathizers, notorious perverts and simple incompetents. If these three points are considered and acted upon, the Lima Confer-

ence could be a serious beginning to organize the world against the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo axis.

Canada is a separate question. That nation is orientated mainly upon the United States in the biggest questions of world policy, but is still closely bound to the Empire, and therefore to Chamberlain, by economic interest and political tradition. And Chamberlain, profoundly uneasy at the repercussions of President Roosevelt's promise of protection to Canada, is hustling off the King and Queen for a hurried trip to Canada to revive the "Empire spirit" that began to droop after Munich. But geography is more potent than titles, and Canada is more American than Imperial, and it is not too optimistic to expect our northern neighbor to join the United States in the anti-fascist front—once we demonstrate that we are organizing it in earnest.

Once the Americas are lined up against "peaceful penetration," intrigues and conspiracies, the next question is: Can it be protected from armed aggression? Before Munich this was "music of the future," but after Munich it is an immediate question. If Hitler gets his African colonies and crushes the Spanish republic, he will have naval bases much closer to Latin America than is New York. If Japan keeps her hold on China, and gets the new capital Chamberlain has promised her, she is all set for the next move in the Pacific, seizure of the Philippines, Guam and Alaska, after which she will be ready for her share of Latin America. We have two oceans, but a one-ocean navy; military experts are very pessimistic about the possibility of keeping the Panama Canal open in case of war; and the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo axis has secured the neutrality if not the co-operation of the British navy so long as Chamberlain is in power. Clearly, defense of the Americas is a big job, and we need still more help to be sure of success. Where can we get it?

First of all, there is the Spanish republic, which, despite Chamberlain, is still alive and fighting heroically and effec-

tively. If the U. S. would simply live up to its treaty obligations to Spain, and to international law, lift the embargo and open our markets to the republic—then the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo axis would be halted by the destruction of their agent Franco, would lose its prospective Atlantic bases, and would lose its cultural and social leverage upon Latin America of a fascist Spain. Food for Spain from America's surplus will help solve a domestic problem, and an open market for Spain will save that land for the world front of the democracies.

Clearly, if the United States wants to protect the Americas, it must adopt this minimum aid to Spain.

If Chamberlain and Daladier remain in power, however, the U. S. still stands alone among the great powers, while its tasks grow heavier. We must, therefore, exert our influence to rouse the British and French people to break with the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo axis, and establish governments that will co-operate with us and not with the fascists. That means we must work with the Peace Coalition in Britain, the potential bloc of the anti-fascist Conservatives, the Liberals and the Labor Party, and pledge our help to them if they set up an anti-fascist government. That means we must work with the *Front Populaire* in France, the anti-Daladier Radicals, the Socialists, the Communists and the great French labor movement—which has just called Daladier to account in the glorious general strike—and promise them our help when they set up the new government of the People's Front.

If Japan is not halted in the Far East, however, she may still upset the applecart for the United States and turn the scales against us; she may go further and step over the line that divides the Far East from the Far West. But Japan cannot do this while the Chinese people are still fighting. And the Chinese people will fight much better if the United States cut off the supplies with which Japan is conducting her war of conquest. And the Chinese people will fight to victory and in-

dependence, if the U. S. would grant them big credits, which China could use to put our unemployed millions to work producing the things she needs for her battle.

Clearly, if the U. S. wants to protect the Americas, it must adopt this minimum aid to China.

But still, with all this, the U. S. will continue to stand alone among the great powers of the world. Is there no other power that can be called to assist the great task of halting fascist world conquest?

Yes, there is another great power. It is the Soviet Union, the greatest power in the world next to the United States.

The United States must face and answer the question: Do we want the Soviet Union on our side in the fight to prevent the current war from engulfing all nations?

Will the United States, and everything that it stands for in the world, be stronger or weaker if it has the co-operation of the Soviet Union, a co-operation based entirely upon clearly-defined *mutual interests*, the guarantee of mutual respect and the principles of international order?

Only a blind fool could deny that the United States would be stronger, that its role in the world would be much greater, that its national interests would be more secure, if it were working in collaboration with the great power of the Soviet Union.

I am not a spokesman for the Soviet Union. The Communist Party of the U.S.A. is not, as the slanderous demagogue Martin Dies charges, "an agency of Moscow." But I am an American as well as a Communist and, with the whole American Party, I can and do claim the Soviet Union as the reliable friend of our nation and our people, and propose in the American national interest that we should seek the co-operation of the Soviet Union in the world crisis in which we find ourselves.

The Soviet Union speaks for herself. She does not need my voice to explain her position on world issues. But I, as an American, have the right and duty to point out to our fellow-

citizens of the United States that the Soviet Union has explicitly laid down the basis for such co-operation with our nation and our government.

Izvestia, official newspaper of the Soviet Union, recently declared:

> At the moment when the greatest discord and confusion exist in the international arena, there is complete clarity between the U.S.S.R. and the United States, which is capable of serving as a basis for further deepening these relations in the interests of world peace....
>
> The United States must, of course, choose its own future foreign policy. Firmly and purposefully the Soviet Union continues to follow its chosen path of active defense of peace and a consistent struggle against aggression. Both countries may still meet each other on this path, and this would have a most beneficial influence on the international situation.

From this side of the United States, the "complete clarity" that exists between the two countries was attested when President Roosevelt sent a friendly message of greeting to President Kalinin on the occasion of the twenty-first anniversary of the founding of the Soviet government.

Two governments, the most powerful in the world, finding their relationship one of the most "complete clarity" and friendliness, are facing the world crisis of a universal fascist aggression while the other great powers are retreating or surrendering; both these great powers are fully determined to defend at all costs their own territories and those neighbors to whom they have accepted obligations; both these great powers are fully devoted to restoration of international order, the inviolability of national boundaries, and the sanctity of treaties.

It is clear that this situation demands the conscious co-operation of the two great powers for their common aims. It is demanded by the national interests of both, and by the interests of all oppressed and suffering humanity. It is demanded for the continued existence of civilization itself.

The same approach to the problem for all peoples of the world was expressed in the recent Manifesto of the Communist International, when it said:

> Only through the medium of an alliance of peoples conducting a self-sacrificing struggle for the cause of peace is it possible to thwart the criminal plans of the war instigators. A defense cordon of armed peoples who have joined their forces with the great Soviet people will doom fascism to impotence and will hasten its defeat and inevitable ruin.

This foreign policy for the United States is only simple common sense. It is a policy which appeals to the needs and the instincts of the American people. It is a policy which needs only to be stated clearly before the masses of the people to obtain their universal endorsement.

This policy is in the direct line of the best traditions of American history. The United States stood in the forefront of world progress and democracy in 1776, despite all difficulties and hardships, with a heroism that formed our basic national character. The United States stood up against world reaction in the War of 1812, and confirmed her democracy and national independence. The United States led world progress in the Civil War of 1861-65, when it wiped out the slave-power and opened the continent for democratic development.

The spirit of Jefferson, Jackson and Lincoln has not departed from the American people. In that spirit we will take our place in the forefront of progress today, facing all the storms aroused by the evil spirits of reaction, and shoulder our responsibilities of organizing the world for peace and progress. And the Communist Party will be in the front ranks of the American people in this struggle.

From the report on "Social and National Security," delivered at a meeting of the National Committee of the Communist Party, U. S. A., held in New York, December 3, 4, and 5, 1938.

V

Is America Menaced by Foreign Propaganda?

YES, America is menaced by foreign propaganda. The propaganda is a menace because it is a weapon of fascist aggression with tremendous military power behind it, which has set out to conquer the world, and above all the richest part of the world, America. It is a menace because it has powerful allies within the United States. The foreign propaganda that menaces the United States, and all the Americas, comes from Rome, Berlin and Tokyo, from the powers that call themselves the "Anti-Communist Alliance." That war-making alliance proclaims that it is fighting to save the world from Communism. It is peculiar that every blow it strikes, presumably against Communism, injures American national interests. It seized Manchuria from China—closing the door of that great area to the United States. It conquered Ethiopia with gas, airplanes and machine-guns—and destroyed the last remnants of the League of Nations' authority. It wiped out independent Austria—and with it the sanctity of international agreements, spitting in the face of America. It made war against all of China, killing millions of men, women and children. It dismembered Czechoslovakia—reducing democratic France to a third-rate power, causing all governments, including the United States, to multiply their armaments. It invades Republican Spain, and lays waste the country, hoping to gain naval bases on the Atlantic and possession of the key to Latin America. It shocks the world with pogroms against the Jews, and with forcible repression of Catholics and Protestants—all this under the propaganda slogan of "fighting Communism."

Propaganda in support or toleration of these war moves appears in the United States. It tells us that America is also menaced by Communism, as were Manchuria, Ethiopia, Austria, China, Czechoslovakia, Spain. And what is this Communist menace? In the United States nothing less than President Roosevelt and the New Deal. So they seriously inform us, and expect us to get excited about it. But this fantastic nonsense, which finds foreign "isms" and propaganda in the middle-of-the-road progressivism of President Roosevelt, is itself the open and clear propaganda of the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo axis. It is the opening gun of a fascist war of conquest against the Americas. Simultaneously all the reactionaries, and their dupes, speak up against American defense. They say that there is no fascist menace to America, that it is all invented by President Roosevelt, and of course the Communists, who are the real war-makers, they say, and threaten the peace of the world by their criticisms of the fascist powers. This is the foreign propaganda that menaces America, menacing because it has military aggression behind it and is spread by some of the most powerful forces within the country and the leading spokesmen of the Anti-New Deal Party.

I know, of course, that I will be given the answer, "Yes, there is a fascist menace, but there is a Communist menace also, even if Mr. Dies did exaggerate it so much, and spread his net too widely." Is it true, however, frankly considered, that there is a "Communist menace?"

Quite sincerely, I can declare there is no Communist menace to America, first because there are not enough Communists to constitute a menace even if they wanted to, and secondly because the Communists don't want to menace America, and wouldn't if they could.

We have only a little more than a hundred thousand members, including the Youth League, and these have all been recruited upon the pledge to defend American democracy against

all enemies, within and without. Let me read to you the preamble of the Constitution of the Communist Party:

> The Communist Party of the United States of America is a working-class political party carrying forward today the traditions of Jefferson, Paine, Jackson, and Lincoln, and of the Declaration of Independence; it upholds the achievements of democracy, the right of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," and defends the United States Constitution against its reactionary enemies who would destroy democracy and all popular liberties.

The preamble then goes on to define the full Communist program, to which we hope at some future time to gain the support of the majority of the people; namely, to make our national economy the possession of the whole nation, by its ownership and operation through a government of the people, by the people and for the people.

Now, most people in America do not agree with this full Communist program. But neither can they, except when incited to hysteria by Red-baiting, see anything seditious or treasonable about it. Most Americans presumably still want their national economy to be owned and operated for private profit by our "best families," while one-third of the nation subsists on precarious relief funds, subject to drastic cuts at the mood and whim of Congress. And so long as the majority wants this system to continue, we Communists join in the condemnation of any efforts to change it forcibly by minority action.

Neither is there any menace, behind the Communists' propaganda, of any hostile foreign power. It is true, the Communists are in power in one great land, the Soviet Union, where they are building a new socialist society. But it is absolutely untrue that the Communists in the United States receive either instructions or gold from Moscow, despite all wild and irresponsible stories to the contrary. Our international affilia-

tions only place upon us additional burdens to help the Communists of other lands who do not have our advantages of the relative freedom of a great democracy. And the Soviet Union, far from being any menace in international relations, is the most consistently peaceful and orderly nation on earth. Its relations with the United States of America are those which naturally obtain between the two most powerful nations of the earth, both interested in peace, both hating war and all war-makers, both threatened by the fascist war alliance, and therefore both interested in paving the way to the fullest possible understanding and co-operation.

The Communists everywhere are fully agreed in wishing to give the fullest co-operation for peace and international order to all those working to that end. The Communists in the United States give full support to all measures looking to orderly progress within our country. Therefore, all talk of the Communists representing the menace of foreign propaganda constitutes in itself but the echo of Hitler, Mussolini and the Mikado. When foreign fascist powers cease to menace their neighbors with aggression, when our native fascists cease to undermine all democratic faith and pledge themselves to democracy, then we can say of fascist propaganda that it is no more a menace. But until that happens the American public will recognize the typical fascist foreign propaganda that really menaces America by one sign: it is always excited about a mythical menace of Communism and denies those real dangers which are forcing our country to unprecedented armaments for defense.

SUMMARY

I am more than pleased with the confirmation of the thesis that I put forward that was given to you by Mr. Matthews. I think he proved the main point that I made. When they car-

ried on propaganda of the Dies Committee against the Communists, they really didn't mean us at all, they meant the New Deal and its whole program of legislative reforms. And when they tell you that Browder is a danger in the country, that is only in order to, over Browder's shoulder, hit President Roosevelt.

As far as the contribution to the discussion by my old friend (if I may say so), Mr. Ernst, I can only say that he gives a marvelous proof of the fiendish ingenuity of Hitler, who is able to include even my friend, Mr. Ernst, in the Anti-Comintern Alliance. But I notice this: in a discussion on the subject, "Is America Menaced by Foreign Propaganda?" not one of the other three speakers had a word to say as to the connection between propaganda that menaces America and the international situation where country after country is menaced not only by propaganda but by military invasion. Not one of them mentioned it, and not one of them raised the question, Why is America multiplying its armaments today? The cause of the multiplication of armaments is the cause of the menace of foreign propaganda in America.

Address delivered as part of a symposium in America's Town Meeting of the Air, NBC Red Network, New York, January 19, 1939.

VI

Lenin and America

We are meeting tonight on the fifteenth anniversary of the death of Vladimir Ilich Lenin. All humanity felt the deep shock of that great loss. In the fifteen years that have passed, the influence of this greatest teacher and guide has grown, has deepened, has permeated the life of the peoples of the whole world.

Not every American understands what an intimate influence Lenin was in his lifetime upon the life of the United States. Yet it is a fact that the Communist Party of the U.S.A., which was born and lives in the tradition and teachings of Lenin, is one of the most universal subjects of discussion in the whole political life of the country.

One of America's outstanding citizens emerged from prison only a few days ago. Tom Mooney's liberation from San Quentin prison after twenty-two years is one of the greatest victories of a rising democratic movement of the American people. But Tom Mooney would have been hung by the neck until he was dead in 1917, except for the intervention of Lenin. Russian workers under Lenin's leadership, demonstrating before the American Embassy in Petrograd in 1917, under banners bearing the slogan "Release Muni," brought about the intervention of President Woodrow Wilson and the commutation of Mooney's sentence from hanging to life imprisonment, making possible the long twenty-two year struggle that finally ended in victory two weeks ago.

Woodrow Wilson appointed a commission of inquiry on the Mooney case, headed by Mr. Felix Frankfurter, now Justice of the Supreme Court. Justice Frankfurter has told how he

took up his task knowing nothing of the case, not knowing who was Tom Mooney or even what were the charges against him. But Lenin knew about Tom Mooney. Lenin acted on his knowledge. And as a result of Lenin's close connection with America, his intense interest in America, his correct ideas about America, the President of the United States appointed Mr. Frankfurter, whose investigation convinced him and the President that Lenin's intervention was a justified one.

When the solemn and dignified United States Senate had before it the nomination of Mr. Frankfurter to the Supreme Court last week, its Committee called upon him for a direct answer to the question whether he is or had ever been a member of the Communist Party. Perhaps this strange and curious question sprang from some vague recollection of how the Mooney case had intertwined Lenin and Frankfurter and Woodrow Wilson in the fabric of history. Perhaps its inspiration was from that member of the Dies Committee who, informed of the nomination of Frankfurter, exclaimed, "It might as well be Harry Bridges or Earl Browder." That classical remark was not merely a brilliant revelation of the Dies Committee's reactionary politics and theory, it was also an unwitting tribute to the rising power of Labor, symbolized by the name of Harry Bridges, and of the living vitality of Lenin's thought in America, symbolized by my name as spokesman for the Communist Party. According to the logic of the Dies Committee, the fact that the nomination of Frankfurter was confirmed unanimously by the Senate, is sufficient proof that that august body has become merely another agency of the followers of Lenin, of the Communist Party.

Need I assure you that we Communists do not accept the Dies Committee estimate of our strength? We are quite sure that we do not control the U. S. Senate, or the American League for Peace and Democracy, or the American Youth Congress, or the American Student Union, or the Southern

Conference for Human Welfare, or the American Federation of Labor, or the Congress of Industrial Organizations, in spite of all the evidence of the Dies Committee and its more than curious array of investigators, experts, and witnesses. Nevertheless, there is some profit in digging deeper into an analysis of the meaning of such fantastic charges.

When the eminent Congressman Thomas of New Jersey, second in command to Martin Dies, exclaims that the names of Frankfurter, Bridges and Browder all mean the same thing to him, and that thing something to be stamped out and destroyed; when the U. S. Senate finds it necessary, at least for its own peace of mind, to put the direct question to Mr. Frankfurter whether he is a member of the Communist Party and to listen to witnesses who claim the President himself is a "Red"—some conclusions inevitably flow from these facts. They provide the most brilliant proof of the teachings of Lenin—and they prove that the Communist Party of the U.S.A. is faithfully applying those teachings. Lenin taught us to identify ourselves with all the active forces of progress in our country, to help to unify and lead them, to isolate the reactionaries and prepare their defeat. We must be accomplishing something in that direction to earn such vicious hatred from the reactionaries like Dies, Ham Fish, Thomas, Garner and company. When the U.S. Senate is not sure from examination of the public record whether Mr. Frankfurter is not a member of the Communist Party, but must put the question to him direct, the worthy solons prove, and make it a matter of public record, not that Frankfurter is a Communist, but that the Communist Party is so completely and effectively supporting progressive and democratic politics identified with Mr. Frankfurter's name and public life, that the Senators do not find it inconceivable, not beyond practical possibility, that a man of his caliber and role might give an affirmative answer to their question. And finally, they give their unanimous approval to

this man for life tenure in the Supreme Court, although they find his record and character not inconsistent with the suspicion that he might be a member of the Communist Party. Never before has the Communist Party received such an overwhelmingly conclusive confirmation of its full citizenship in democratic America.

Further, is it possible that the dignified Senate would have found it possible to ask such a question if the nominee had been Carter Glass, or Burke, or Alf Landon, or Vandenberg, or Garner, or Hoover? Clearly, impossible! Such a question to such men would be so ridiculous that not even a Senator could ask it! And a Senator would consider it indelicate to question such gentlemen about their sympathies with Hitler. That fact also is significant enough to point out and emphasize.

It is because the Communists are equipped with the theory of Lenin, are imbued with Lenin's spirit, that is why our Party has come to exercise an influence far beyond its numbers, which are still relatively small.

Lenin always insisted upon facing reality, he was the uncompromising foe of utopianism and wishful thinking. It is with this Leninist attitude that we Communists guard against any exaggeration of our Party's influence, that we guard against placing immediate tasks which are not matured. We know that the very broad influence exerted by our Party is not a sign that the American masses are ready to build socialism in our country now, as an immediately practical task. It is the guiding thought of everything we do to prepare and educate the masses for socialism, and to lead them to its realization when they are ready. But nothing is farther from our minds than any abortive attempts of a small minority to impose its will upon the masses. We base ourselves completely upon the democratic masses, upon the working class and all toilers who comprise the overwhelming majority of the people, and we set no tasks that the masses are not themselves to be the

moving and decisive factor in accomplishing. We are first and last democratic in this most fundamental sense. And it is only because we have made this point unmistakably clear that we are steadily growing in numbers, and even more in influence, even though we are still a small fraction of the population.

This growth has been facilitated by the fact that the United States, although the land of the highest developed capitalism, has many affinities with the Soviet Union, the land of socialism where Lenin's ideas have entirely triumphed. The two countries are similar in their broad expanse of territory, in the problems of the conquest of nature, of harnessing their enormous natural resources for the benefit of their peoples. This created many common national characteristics which, even before the destruction of the tsarist autocracy, had brought about a friendly attitude of the two peoples toward each other, an intense interest in one another between the American and Russian peoples, a feeling of kinship that surmounted all barriers.

Since the rise of the new socialist government out of the ruins of the old tsarist Russian Empire, since the Soviet Union has transformed that formerly backward land into the economically most advanced country in the world, with the single exception of the United States, the affinities, the common interests, the sympathies, between the peoples of the two countries have grown by leaps and bounds. And the political development of the world, with the rise of the Berlin-Rome-Tokyo war-alliance of fascism which threatens the destruction of all civilization, predetermines with the inexorability of natural law an historic collaboration. Both are threatened by the same enemies, both have a national interest in peace and orderly relations between nations. It is clear that neither can fully realize its own destiny without the friendly collaboration of the other.

It required the genius, the deep insight into the laws of

history, of Lenin to foresee this development many years ago. But today the world situation makes it so clear that the Communists are no longer alone in recognizing that history itself has prepared and demands the collaboration of the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. as the price of saving the world from catastrophe. The most farsighted and advanced representatives of all classes in America recognize this fact and move, even if hesitantly as yet, toward its realization.

The most reactionary groups and interests also recognize it, and their spokesmen conduct a hysterical struggle to prevent its realization, to block the road of history. They do everything they can to hide from the masses the natural and necessary friendship and collaboration between the two great countries which alone can realize the vital national interests of both, while serving the international interests of all toiling humanity. They cry out against us, the Communists, that we are agents of a foreign power trying to get America to sacrifice its own interests in favor of the Soviet Union. But such hysterical jingoism quickly reveals its true face, when we see that it must also proclaim American isolation in the whole world, the retreat of America before the threatening advance of world fascism, the surrender of point after point necessary for any ultimate defense, in short, when they demonstrate that they are American duplicates of Premier Chamberlain, and want to follow his belly-crawling journeys to Berchtesgaden, Godesburg, Munich and Rome. They are already potential traitors to America; they welcome the world conquest of the fascist powers, and propose to do what they can to assist it. That is why they reject the collaboration of the U.S. with the U.S.S.R.

Defense against the aggression of the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo war alliance has now become a life-and-death issue for all the rest of the world, including the United States. And defense today involves armaments, although armaments is not the sole

answer, as some seem to think, nor even half the answer. But an unarmed people in the world of Hitler aggression is the predestined victim of fascist conquest. The United States, with the rest of the world, must choose between uniting the anti-fascist and democratic forces for common defense—a defense by arms in the last analysis—or submitting to fascist world conquest.

The overwhelming majority of the American people are convinced of this. The Communist Party of the U.S.A., for the first time in its existence, has come to the conclusion that it is necessary to take a positive attitude toward armaments, because it cannot refute the reasons that lead the American people to the same conclusion. At the same time, we warn the people, that a correct attitude and policy, to give American leadership and co-operation in uniting the peace forces of the world, are worth more than a doubled navy as a defense factor. A correct peace policy is the only thing that will make armaments a real defense.

In this we follow Lenin's line on war and peace, on national defense, which never was pacifist, and which always insisted upon the necessity to study each situation concretely, and not take up a dogmatic position.

What nonsense it is for the United States, however, to give attention only to increasing its navy and air force, while continuing policies which help make bigger armaments necessary! What criminal stupidity it is for the U.S. to help Hitler and Mussolini put their puppet in power in Spain, by the unneutral embargo against the Spanish republic and the unneutral Neutrality Act! We are actually helping to create the fascist menace to Latin America which has our government in such an excitement of worry! We are actually supplying Japan with the means of subjugating China and closing the entire Far East to American interests, which has already become so insolent as to threaten to smash the American navy if we dare

to fortify the island of Guam! The heroic Spanish and Chinese peoples are fighting our battles for us. We are denying our help to them while we help their enemies. If they lose, the U.S. will surely be faced with the terrible reality of war or surrender. Under such circumstances, before armaments contribute anything at all to our security, we must lift the embargo from Spain, scrap the Neutrality Act, give aid to Spain and China, and proclaim our readiness to co-operate with all who resist fascist aggression—including the Soviet Union—and then armaments will begin to have some sense. Then the American people can wholeheartedly support the admirable and courageous declarations of President Roosevelt, because they will have dissolved the fatal contradictions now existing between these declarations and the criminal help being given to the fascists.

It is not only the Communists who have changed their attitude to armaments. If that were so, we would question whether we are correct in changing. We find the proof of our correctness in the realignment of all major class forces on this issue. Wall Street has suddenly become pacifist! Herbert Hoover is the main spokesman for disarmament and proclaims peace to all the world including Hitler and Japan—but not the Soviet Union. The Republican Party suddenly discovers that our President's attitude on foreign affairs is a disturbing factor in world affairs and threatens the peace of America. One and all, they have become converts to the Chamberlain policy of "appeasement," but without Chamberlain's concurrent policy of rearmament; where Chamberlain secretly sabotages rearmament, our own reactionaries come out publicly against it. It is the democratic mass movement of the people that demands today an unyielding foreign policy against the war-makers, and armaments to back it up, while the whole reactionary camp is moving swiftly toward open defeatism, pacifism and disarmament. They are moving toward treason, following the foot-

steps of the Federalists in Jefferson's time, of the Whigs of the time of Andrew Jackson, of the Copperheads of the time of Abraham Lincoln.

We are not surprised by these sudden changes in the position of the main class forces in the United States on such vital questions. In fact, we expected them. We were prepared for them, because we had studied Lenin, and from Lenin we had learned to dig deep down into the laws that govern political development of classes and nations. And thereby we had found our own place quickly and precisely in this political development.

We of the Communist Party have played a leading part in the current movement of popular thought toward the re-discovery and revaluation of American history. Today it is well to recall that it was Lenin who gave our thinking its impetus in this direction, when he wrote his famous "Letter to American Workers," calling our attention to the great revolutionary traditions of our country, to 1776 and 1861, and to the tremendous influence they wield in the whole world. All thinking Americans are today more interested in studying and understanding their own history than for many generations past. Allow me to mention, as symbols of this awakening to history, the presentations of Lincoln and John Brown on the stage, in plays that excel not only in artistry, but in depth of understanding of our present day in relation to the great periods of the past. Or the recent motion pictures regarding Andrew Jackson, both of the periods of the Battle of New Orleans and of the Presidency; while these pictures left much to be desired politically, they were contributions in the main stream of American thought. And of books, we now have a growing stream of them, with the quality steadily improving. Even the reactionaries and fascist-minded ones are re-writing American history, coming out openly with the Trotskyist thesis that Aaron Burr, the infamous traitor, was the real hero of the American Revolution. But the re-discovery of American his-

tory gives small comfort to the reactionaries, while it strengthens and enthuses the camp of democracy and progress—for example, the speech of President Roosevelt not long ago, on Jackson Day.

President Roosevelt is a conscious defender of capitalism. He has not the slightest inclination toward socialism, toward the Communist solution of the ills of America. Yet our President's courageous revival of the best democratic traditions of American history, in bold defiance of world fascism and of the reactionaries at home—including those in the President's own party—and in rejection of the cowardly appeasement policy of Chamberlain and Daladier, has furnished an extraordinary demonstration of the profound genius of Lenin's analysis. Those circles of the reactionaries, of monoply capital and its agents, who burn with furious hatred of the President, to whom the people give enthusiastic support, and even incite violence against him, furnish an even more remarkable proof of the correctness of Lenin's ideas. It is the blind hatred of the reactionaries against the democratic mass movement in support of the President and his policies, that is leading these gentlemen, who always claimed to represent "the nation," rapidly toward open treason to the nation, to open support of the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo alliance, and to its encroachments upon American national interests.

The pre-war socialist movement of the United States was weak in Marxian theory, and especially Lenin's contribution was a closed book to it. That is why the old Socialist Party never succeeded in steering a course that avoided the Scylla of opportunist compromise of socialist objectives, and the Charibdis of sectarian contempt for immediate mass struggles for a better life. It was one of the results of the victory of Lenin's ideas in the Great October Revolution that Marxism was again brought to life in America, enriched and deepened by Lenin. It was Lenin's clear and penetrating thought which

showed the vanguard of the American working class, which took all that was best in the old Socialist Party and united it with all the other streams of advanced thought in the American labor movement in founding our Communist Party almost twenty years ago, how to find the clear channel of a true revolutionary policy between the rocks of right opportunism and leftist sectarianism.

It was Lenin's direct influence, continued and deepened by Stalin, which brought the American working-class vanguard, organized in the Communist Party, to its present degree of maturity in which it is able to be the staunchest and most clear-headed builder of the democratic front of the people against reaction, fascism and war, and at the same time, the most effective pathfinder to the socialist future. It is Leninism, organically growing on American soil, which has begun to realize in some degree for the American people the heroic perspective opened up for the world by Dimitroff at the Seventh World Congress.

In the present world crisis, when the fascist war-makers with their reactionary allies throughout the world threaten to destroy all the fruits of human progress painfully accumulated through the ages, the American people are rallying for the great impending battles, preparing for big storms. In these preparations for times of trial, they find inspiration and support in their own great revolutionary traditions, in the heroic examples of the Spanish and Chinese peoples, and in that great fortress of peace and progress, the Soviet Union. The American people are finding their way, step by step, in the light of the teachings of our great Lenin, to the united front of all forces of progress to meet and solve the immediate issues of the crisis.

It remains a fact that the great masses of the American people are still not understanding the final and complete solution of capitalism's crisis in the socialist revolution, in the transfer of the national economy into the possession of the

nation's toilers, in the abolition of exploitation of man by man. They still seek for the democratic path within the limitations of the anti-democratic framework of a decaying capitalist system. Therefore the road ahead is by no means a broad, clear highway. The experiences of the struggle for the democratic solution of the immediate problems, enlightened by persistent teachings of the Communists who participate loyally in the mass struggle, and by the glorious example of the Soviet Union —these factors alone will finally bring the full teachings of Lenin to the American workers and toiling masses, and thereby bring the final victory of socialism.

In the immediate situation of our country, and of the world, the first and major task is to weld the firm unity of the working class with the democratic majority of the people against fascist aggression and world conquest, and to unite America with the peace forces of the whole world.

In the living and strengthening mass movement toward a better life, toward peace and international order, we can truly say that the spirit of Lenin lives in our country and exercises a growingly decisive influence. In that fact is the promise of fruitful co-operation between the democracy of America and the socialist democracy of the Soviet Union. In that fact is the guarantee of the defeat of world fascism. In that fact is the guarantee of a new era of human progress.

Address delivered at Lenin Memorial Meeting, City Auditorium, Philadelphia, January 20, 1939.

VII

The Economics of Communism: The Soviet Economy in Its World Relation

Since the rise of the modern Communist or Socialist movement, dating from *The Communist Manifesto*, written by Karl Marx and Frederick Engels in 1848, which proposes that the national economy of each country should be taken over by its people, acting through its government, abolishing private ownership in the means of production and distribution, the issues thus raised have been the very center of all economic and political thought and controversy. Until the rise and consolidation of the Soviet Union it was not possible to refer the issue to the test of practice, and to compare the *performance* of the rival schools of economics in practical life. Now that the Soviet Union has entered its twenty-second year, such a comparison is not only possible, but becomes necessary and inescapable as the final test of all disputed issues.

The final argument of all defenders of capitalist economy, that is, of all forms of economy based upon private ownership of the basic economy of each country and its operation upon the principle of search for maximum private profit, is to the effect that this capitalist system has demonstrably in the past hundred years multiplied man's productive powers, and that it alone can and does result in maximum production of wealth; while, conversely, any form of common ownership and operation would result in economic decline and eventual collapse.

The basic argument for socialism or Communism is to the opposite effect, namely, that while capitalism did expand man's productive forces, it can no longer do so, that it is precisely capitalistic private ownership and operation that must result,

and is resulting, in the decline of economic life and in economic crisis and collapse. Now let us proceed to a check-up of these two arguments in the light of what has actually been going on in the world for the past twenty years.

I turn first of all to statistics of world production in manufacturing and mining, as given in the *Statistical Year Book of the League of Nations* for 1937-38. Taking 1929 as an index of 100, which represents the highest point reached up to that time, we find that by 1933, the low point of the world crisis, production had declined to 77.7. From that point on there is recovery until 1938, the index reaching 109.7 for 1936, above that for 1937, with the exact figure not yet published, while 1938 showed a distinct decline.

What do these figures show? That the world, predominantly capitalist, was not able to rise above 1929 more than 10 per cent, and last year even lost that gain and went back almost, if not entirely, to the 1929 level. Capitalism has not been able to lead the world back to recovery; it still leaves the world economy in stagnation.

Perhaps it may occur to some that the reason why world economy remains in such dire straits lies in the fact that the rise of the Soviet Union has taken one-sixth of the world out of the capitalist orbit. The figures which were cited include the Soviet Union; it may be argued, therefore, that it is the influence of Soviet economy, the inability of a workers' regime properly to administer a great land, that has pulled down the world index figure so lamentably. To examine this question, we turn to another League of Nations index, namely, that of world production *excluding* the Soviet Union, which they conveniently provide us. What does that show to us?

Again taking 1929 as 100, we find that the capitalist world had declined in 1933 to the low point of 71.3, or 6.6 per cent lower than the whole world including the Soviet Union. Further, the recovery after 1933 was not nearly so favorable as

the index showed for the combined capitalist and socialist worlds; taking the capitalist world alone, 1936 is no longer almost 10 per cent above 1929, but lags at 95.5; 1937 barely crawls above 1929, with a figure of 102.5, while 1938, with the exact figure unknown, is definitely below 100 again.

Facts give us the clear answer: It was not the Soviet Union which dragged down the world index, but on the contrary, it was the Soviet Union which made the world showing more favorable by far than the capitalist lands, taken separately, can show.

Partisans for the United States economy, as against the rest of the world, both capitalist and socialist, may call upon us for the comparative figures of our own country, the stronghold of capitalism, which represents more than half the total economy of the capitalist world. If the expectation is that the U.S.A. makes a better showing, then it is doomed to disappointment. Our own country lagged behind the rest of the capitalist world, and was the chief influence dragging down the whole index. Where the combined world index in 1933 was 77.7, and the capitalist world taken separately was 71.3, that of the U.S.A. had descended to the depths of 64.3; the highest point of recovery of the U.S. in 1937 was only 93.2, while 1938 dropped to about 90 or below, exact figure not yet known. In all these comparisons, I have used the statistical tables of the League of Nations.

Let us turn now to the argument of those who say that the fascist powers, Germany, Italy and Japan, furnish an exception to the general trend of the capitalist world, that the Berlin-Rome-Tokyo axis has found a path to recovery which the democracies have not yet discovered. Here we are forced to compare index figures of varying bases, not directly comparable, but which reveal the basic trend and underlying facts clearly enough.

For Germany, we take the semi-official figures of the *Institut*

für Konjunkturforschung, therefore the most favorable interpretation that can possibly be put upon the facts. With the year 1928 taken as the base of 100, German economy reached its low point in 1932 with a figure of 59; 1933 was 66, while 1937 had risen to 117. But the slightest examination of the constituent parts of German economy proves the fact, which we would know from general information, that the preponderant part of this increase is accounted for by armaments and fortifications, and therefore covers up the real condition of the general economy, which is undoubtedly not above, and is probably below, the general level of the capitalist world.

Italy's statistics demonstrate this fact even more decisively. Using the figures of the *Ministero delle Corporazioni*, 1928 taken as 100, Italian economy descended in 1932 to 73, and in 1937 had reached only 109, still below the general world level, and only ten points above all of Europe, notwithstanding all the influence of Italian armaments.

Japan's index is more favorable on the surface, the *Ministry of Commerce and Industry* claiming an index of 170 in 1937, based upon the 1931-33 average as 100; but in the case of Japan there is no dispute from any source that these figures reflect entirely the combined influences of inflation and the enormous expenditures of the Japanese aggression in China.

These official figures completely destroy all pretense that the fascist powers have discovered any secret formula for economic recovery.

Now that we have the main outlines of world economy and its direction of development, together with that of the capitalist world, of the U.S.A., and of the Berlin-Rome-Tokyo axis, taken separately, we can use these figures as the background from which to approach more concretely our examination of the economy of the land of socialism, the Soviet Union, which is our main subject today.

First of all, let us remind ourselves of a few basic facts,

economic and historical, which condition the development of the Soviet Union. Its area constitutes one-sixth of the earth's surface, and its population about one-twelfth of that of the world. It is two and a half times the area of the United States and forty times that of Germany, occupying the eastern half of Europe and the northern third of Asia. It contains unrivaled natural resources of all kinds.

But up to the World War, this great area, under the tsarist empire, had remained economically the most backward among the modern nations. To the extent that its economy had been developed along modern capitalist lines, it was largely dependent upon Western European capital and technical management, and economically it was more and more becoming a colony of foreign capital. The World War, with the civil war and invasions that followed the Revolution, almost completely destroyed its industry.

The new Soviet power that undertook the building of a new economic system, therefore, had to begin almost from the bare ground. It was further denied any effective help from abroad beyond a small minimum of imports and technical assistance which it could pay for cash on delivery. These are the chief positive and negative features of the conditions under which the new socialist economy was erected.

From the World War until 1921, when the civil war and interventions were ended, the economy of Russia was continuously shrinking, until the products of its industry had declined in value from a little more than ten billion rubles in 1913 to less than 17 per cent of that volume, or 1,700 million rubles in 1920. Then the Soviet Union began the reparation of its shattered economy, arriving in 1927 at a total national production equal in volume to that of 1913, the last year before the World War. This was the time, also, when the capitalist world had recuperated sufficiently to surpass once more its pre-war level of pro-

duction, and is the point at which we began our examination of the trends of world economy.

Up to this time, the Russian and world economic trends had gone, on the whole, parallel, except that Russia's decline had been more precipitate and to a lower point, while its recovery had been correspondingly quicker. But with 1928-29, a sharp divergence begins between the course of economy in the capitalist world and that of the Soviet Union. The divergence is sharp and startling. While the capitalist economy went into decline which by 1933 had dropped 40 per cent of its production, the Soviet economy began to rise at a rate unparalleled in history; while by 1938 the capitalist world had barely climbed back to its 1929 level and had slipped behind it again, the Soviet economy in the same period had increased its industrial production by more than one thousand per cent, had multiplied it more than ten-fold.

To bring this contrast closer home, we may recall that from 1928 to 1932, our country, under the leadership of Herbert Hoover, dropped more than 40 per cent of its national income into the abyss of economic crisis, dropping from 80 billion dollars to 45 billion; during that same period, the period of the First Five-Year Plan, the Soviet Union doubled its national income, which rose from 25 billion to 50 billion rubles. From 1933 to 1937, our country, under the leadership of President Roosevelt, painfully struggled out of the Hoover pit and regained most of its losses; during the same period the Soviet Union again doubled its national income, which rose from 50 billion to 100 billion rubles, through the successful execution of the Second Five-Year Plan. In 1938, the economy of our country again declined, while the national income of the Soviet Union again surged forward to 112 billion rubles; while the leaders of American economy can only express the *hope* that our country will climb a little above the 1929 level in the next few years, the leaders of the Soviet Union can confidently an-

nounce the *plan* whereby the national income will, in 1942, have increased by 88 per cent, or almost doubled, over 1937.

For another comparison, we may refer again to the statistical tables of the League of Nations. This shows the comparative index of industrial production of the U.S. for the years 1928, 1933, and 1936, at the figures of 111, 76 and 105, respectively. For the same years, the corresponding index for the Soviet Union stands at the figures of 100, 250, and 481. If we had the index of this series for 1937 and 1938, the gap would be greatly extended.

All the facts of the past ten years go to prove conclusively that, if we accept the test of performance, of verified deeds in actual life, the capitalist economy has failed to sustain itself on its previously-achieved level, it shows no promise of any fundamental recovery, it demonstrates all the symptoms of a system which is fatally ill, which is destroying its own reserves, which is preparing the conditions of its own death and disappearance. But in contrast to the obvious failure of capitalist economy, there is to be seen an equally obvious success of the new socialist economy, a success not only in contrast with the current failure of capitalism, but an outstanding success when compared with the achievements of capitalism in its previous days of greatest growth. For never in all its history has capitalism presented a single instance of the growth of a national economy that approaches more than 20 per cent of the growth of Soviet economy under the Five-Year-Plans.

During this week, the Soviet Union will be giving final shape to its Third Five-Year Plan. The preliminary figures already published indicate that it calls for an 88 per cent increase in national income, compared with 100 per cent increase during each of the First and Second Plans. If there remains any skepticism in my audience as to the validity of these figures, allow me to refer to one of the most conservative organs of American

capitalism, namely, *Business Week*, which has the following to say in its issue of February 11, 1939, on this point:

> In 1927, when Moscow announced its first Five-Year Plan, the world viewed skeptically the prospect of industrializing a nation of 160,000,000 "according to plan." In 1939, most of the skepticism is gone. Moscow still has far to go to attain its goal of outstripping "all the capitalist countries," but its accomplishments are impressive, and its newest plan is more modest than was the first.

Yes, even for the American business world, most of the skepticism is gone regarding the achievement of Soviet economy. *Business Week* has raised, however, two interesting lines of further inquiry, in the course of making this declaration. One is the query: How long will it be before the Soviet economy surpasses that of the capitalist world; and the second is: What is the scope of a modest plan for a socialist economy from the point of view of American businessmen.

On the first point, it is already established that since 1928 the Soviet Union advanced from the last place to the second among the great powers, in terms of industrial production, being exceeded only by the United States. Thus it has already outstripped "all the capitalist countries" of Europe. The only thing still uncertain is how long it will take to outstrip the United States, the colossus of capitalism, which exceeds all other capitalist countries combined in wealth production. To this remaining question, a tentative answer can be given now: If the U.S.A. and the Soviet Union each performs in the next ten years as they did in the past decade, then before that time is over the Soviet economy will have surpassed our country also. Thus, although we may not disagree with *Business Week* that the Soviet Union has "far to go," yet it is clear that it travels so fast this may not take a very long time.

Now let us examine more closely the task undertaken by the Third Five-Year Plan which *Business Week* considers rela-

tively modest. The general increase of 88 per cent is the average of an increase of 103 per cent in production of means of production and 70 per cent increase in production of consumption articles. Thus, while doubling its capacity for future production, the Soviet peoples will be enjoying an improvement in their immediate living standards by more than two-thirds. If the United States economy should perform just half of that "modest" task, on the basis of its already existing economy, it would exceed the most wildly optimistic expectations ever expressed by its own devoted supporters. Therefore, while we can agree that the Third Five-Year Plan sets a relatively modest goal, we take note that what is a modest perspective for a socialist economy would be an obvious exaggeration for a capitalist economy. This is still more emphasized when we compare this goal with total 1928 production, and find that the *amount of increase* in the next five years will be *four times as much* as the total production of 1928; if the U.S.A. produced a total four times as much in 1942 as in 1928, our national income would then be around 300 billion dollars instead of its present approximate 65 billions.

It must be admitted quite frankly that the progress of the Soviet economy in overtaking the capitalist world has been greater in total than in *per capita* production; that means, while it has surpassed all European countries in amount of production, it is still in productivity per worker behind several of the technically most advanced nations. That is because it has engaged the entire population in its economy, has expanded its working class from 11,000,000 in 1928 to 26,000,000 in 1937; these new industrial recruits were raw peasants, and have had to receive prolonged and difficult training in modern industry to transform them into fully qualified workers. The rapid mechanization of all economy, the high spirit of emulation among the workers exemplified in the Stakhanov movement, the tremendous educational and cultural work, and

the rapid rise in living standards, all of which are outstanding features of Soviet economy today, proved sufficient guarantee that in *per capita productivity* also the Soviet Union will rapidly overtake and surpass the capitalist countries.

Are there any visible natural limits to the expansion of the Soviet economy? It is very difficult to discern any. Its area of 5,000 billions of acres contains every requirement of the national economy for the indefinite future. To give a few examples: the already surveyed iron ore deposits exceed 10 billion tons, and if iron-bearing quartzites are included the figure is 260 billion tons. Surveyed oil reserves exceed six billion tons, more than half the resources of the world. Known coal deposits contain 1,654 billion tons, second only to the U.S.A. Water-power resources exceed 280 million kilowatts, much greater than any other country. The population is greater in number than any other industrial country, but there is plenty of room for expansion, as the population per square mile is the lowest; the natural growth of the population is almost five times as much as any other industrial country.

One of the most important, and least clear for the American public, among all questions of comparison between the socialist and capitalist economies, is that of the relative results upon the living standards of the working populations. If we accept the standard of weekly earnings in industry as the measure of living standards, and their movement during the past ten years, then all capitalist countries show a decline while the Soviet Union reveals a steady and sharp rise.

Again quoting the League of Nations statistics, the U.S.A. index figure of weekly earnings, taking 1929 as 100, declined to 60 in 1932, recovered to 78 in 1935, and to 95 in 1937 (the League does not yet give a figure for 1938, but it is known to have declined). The German index declined from 100 in 1929, to 67 in 1932, recovering to 75 in 1935, and to 80 in 1937. The Soviet Union rises from 100 in 1929 steadily each

year to 240 in 1935, the latest figure of the League of Nations; while from Soviet sources we can conservatively estimate that the same index, when published, for 1936 will be around 300, and for 1937 around 380.

What has been the trend of the intellectual workers in the Soviet Union can be sufficiently indicated by comparative figures of their average yearly wages in 1932 and 1937, during which period the rise was from 3,636 to 6,502 rubles.

Another method of comparison is that of the volume of production of articles intended for mass consumption, which to some degree inevitably reflects the trend of living standards of the population. The United States index of consumption goods declined from 111 in 1928 (the basis being 1923-25 average), to 98 in 1933, rising then to 110 in 1937, still somewhat below 1928. For Germany, the index of 100 in 1928 dropped to 83 in 1933, and rose to 103 in 1936. For the Soviet Union, the index rose to 201 in 1933, and to 348 in 1936. In each case I have taken the latest figures published by the League of Nations, in order to avoid any suspicion that the comparison may be considered by anyone to be unbalanced or unfair. It may be remarked, by the way, however, that the Third Five-Year Plan in the Soviet Union envisages the multiplication of consumers goods by approximately 70 per cent in 1942 over the figure of 1937, which means that the *increase* in consumption articles per capita will be many times the *total* means produced in 1928. Nothing even remotely approaching this rapid rise in the means of livelihood is even dreamed about for any capitalist country.

With regard to the agricultural population, I have not had sufficient time at my disposal to gather adequate comparative data. It is well known, however, that in every capitalist country agriculture has been in continuous crisis ever since the war, and that the decline of income of the farm population has been especially catastrophic. In the Soviet Union, however, since

1933, when its agriculture definitely moved above the pre-war level, the income of the collective farms, comprising 98 per cent of the farm population, increased by 2.7 times up to 1937, while the amount of income distributed in money form multiplied by 4.5 times.

By this time the simple examination of comparative figures will have raised the question in the minds of any person, if he does not deliberately close his mind to such thoughts, as to why the Soviet Union, which started so far behind us in productive powers only a few years ago, is forging ahead so rapidly as already to surpass all other countries but the U.S.A., and to promise to surpass the U.S.A. itself within ten or fifteen years at the outside; while the countries of greatest resources lag behind and cannot even maintain their past achievements.

Is there anything wrong with the American people, the workers, farmers, and technicians, that they could not move forward with equal speed, or at least with half the speed, as the Soviet peoples have been advancing? Clearly, there is nothing wrong with the American people as *producers*, but on the contrary they are a hundred times better prepared for economic advance than the Soviet peoples, insofar as their individual technical capacities are concerned, and many times as well prepared insofar as already existing machinery is concerned. Neither can we say that natural resources and geographical position can account for the difference between the performance of the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R., for these differences favor the Soviet Union only in the long perspective of the next fifty or one hundred years but have no immediate consequence. The answer, therefore, must be found in the difference in the *economic system*, in the different relations of production as between socialism and capitalism.

Under our economic system of capitalism, the national economy is under the private ownership and operation of a relatively small section of the population, the incentive to pro-

duction being entirely dominated by the search for private profit on the part of these private owners. The result is anarchy in economic life, which periodically brings crisis, which grows progressively more deep and profound. The accumulated surplus production becomes more difficult of reinvestment in expanded production in proportion as it increases in volume.

It is characteristic of this fundamental contradiction of capitalism that when its economic machinery enters a crisis, and paralyzes the nation, the explanation is immediately found, not in lack of production, but in *overproduction.* Because we have produced so much, more than our capitalist economy knows how to make use of, therefore the whole nation is thrown into crisis and chaos, and large sections of the owning class itself are bankrupted and dispossessed. The emergency measures whereby our government attempts to bring some order out of this chaos inevitably take the form of governmental intervention in the economic set-up, directed toward putting idle capital and man-power back to work under governmental direction. But these emergency measures are themselves deprived of much of their effectiveness by the imperative demand on the part of capitalists that such governmental intervention shall be kept down to the minimum, and shall be directed into channels entirely outside the normal development of economic life. We therefore have the crying anomaly that it is precisely in the period when our economic life is in crisis and depression, when the standards of living have been falling most disastrously, that we have suddenly blossomed out in a veritable orgy of public improvements of all kinds.

The present capitalist system has accumulated idle capital and idle man-power which it is no longer able to bring together in any normal way, and has no prospect of ever bringing together again in the normal processes of capitalism. Its emergency measures, typified by the New Deal, while absolutely essential to the continued existence of a large part of the

population, are in themselves no cure for this condition, because they scrupulously keep within the limits of the capitalist mode of production, and avoid the slightest competition with private capital which monopolizes all fields except the narrowest margin of public works.

The unexampled economic success of the Soviet Union is made possible by its system of organization, by the economic relations established between the producers and the productive machinery. The productive wealth of the country is collectively owned and operated by the entire population acting through their government. Whatever surplus they accumulate belongs to all, and there can never be such a problem as overproduction, the bugbear of capitalism. The entire economy is brought under a national plan, which expresses not a *hope* which may or may not be realized, but a decision which experience has proved can be fulfilled, in the main, and often even overfulfilled. It makes maximum utilization of all the productive forces, men and machinery, and constantly raises the level of performance by the systematic application of scientific principles. It realizes, for the first time in history, the full capacity of humanity for the expansion and enrichment of life, first of all materially, and upon that basis culturally and spiritually.

There is an old superstition, often repeated in the textbooks of capitalist economics, that the establishment of socialism is merely the confiscation of the wealth of capitalism which is then divided and dissipated among the masses, leaving them worse off than before because it "killed the goose that laid the golden eggs." But the original confiscation of the national economy from the hands of private owners was of supreme importance, not because of the amount of wealth involved (in the Soviet Union it was relatively small), but because it made the people master of their own destiny. The *new wealth*, directly produced by the new economy and which would not exist at all, except for the new economy, already amounts to ten

and twenty times that of pre-war times. To illustrate this, we may compare the 1913 value of the fixed capital of large-scale industry, which was 7,200,000,000 rubles, with the 1937 value (measured with the same scale) of 50,400,000,000 rubles. This unprecedented rate of accumulation was entirely out of their own resources. As a matter of fact, the old capital has almost entirely disappeared, and the entire economy is practically new, the product of the socialist system.

No other country can hope or expect to expand its economy at any rate comparable to that of the Soviet Union, so long as it clings to the outmoded and self-defeating system that we know as capitalism.

It is, therefore, only a question of time and of a relatively short time in terms of history, a matter of decades at most, until the superior merit of the socialist system in the Soviet Union will have proved itself by producing a land so overwhelmingly rich, prosperous and culturally advanced, above all the rest of the world, that the peoples of all lands will inevitably be compelled by the simple dictates of common sense, to adopt the same principles as the Soviet Union, or resign themselves to permanent backwardness and decay. There is no escape from the logic of the facts of world experience in the last twenty years, and particularly of the past decade.

It is this certainty of the future, which is the foundation of the foreign policy of the Soviet Union, which is a policy of peace and international order, of co-operation with all forces in the world which want to maintain peace and international order. The only thing which can threaten the Soviet economy in its triumphal march forward is war. Therefore the Soviet Union wants peace above all else, and is ready to co-operate with everyone who for any reason also want peace. The Soviet Union concedes to every people and nation the right to decide its own system and its own policies so long as they allow the same privilege to others. The Soviet people and government

avoid every act or even utterance which could in any way be interpreted as a dictation, or desire to dictate, to any other people. It relies entirely upon the example of its own achievements, as its only influence upon other peoples, an influence entirely intellectual and moral, as was the influence of the new republic of the United States upon the world after 1776. Its armaments are entirely for the defense of its own increasingly prosperous and rich economy against the threatening attacks from without. It is supremely confident of its ability to defend itself against any enemy or collection of enemies.

Regardless of whether one may approve or disapprove of the inner regime of the Soviet Union, and of its economic system, one thing is clear beyond all doubt for every American who loves his country and wishes to preserve its independence and well-being. That is, that the Soviet Union, its government and its people, are natural friends of the United States and its people, and the two nations are naturally friends, with common aims and faced with common enemies, in the present strained and dangerous international situation, in which the new world war is already begun. There is no possible or conceivable course of events which could place the United States and the Soviet Union on opposite sides in the world-alignment which is being hammered out by the aggressions of the Berlin-Rome-Tokyo Alliance of war-making powers. The Soviet Union is unalterably on the side of international order and peace, against all aggressions everywhere in the world; the only way in which the United States could be on the opposite side would be for our country to enter the path of imperialistic aggression as a partner of the Berlin-Rome-Tokyo axis, and this, I think it will be agreed, is so directly contrary to the whole history, tradition, and temper of the American people, as to be unthinkable.

It is, therefore, of supreme importance to all Americans, regardless of their economic and political convictions otherwise,

to understand the Soviet Union, its growing weight in world affairs, the system out of which arises its growing strength, and its potentiality as an active friend of our country in a world full of dangers and pitfalls. Perhaps we will be able to learn something from the economic system of the Soviet Union which will help us to solve our American problems. But whether that is so or not, and on this question some of my audience may disagree, it cannot be denied that the Soviet Union is a great and growing power in the world, upon the basis of the Soviet economy, that it is a power most friendly to the United States with no interests or policies which could change this friendship to its opposite, and therefore, and finally, that American citizens of all opinions who love their country should try to understand and utilize more effectively this great, growing and friendly power for the protection of American national interests, which are the interests of one hundred and thirty million American people, which are the interests of world peace.

Address delivered at Town Hall, New York, February 27, 1939, in the series "World Economic Issues: the Future of America."

Index

Abraham Lincoln Battalion, 22, 31
Adams, John, 114
Aggressors, 17, 18, 20, 22, 39, 52, 57, 83 ff., 88, 93, 103, 108, 139, 148, 170, 218; American aid to, 66, 149, 194; boycott of, 57; condemnation by U.M.W.A. of, 58 ff.; definition of, 95; embargo against, 89, 92; successes of, 84, 102; Norman Thomas and, 124
Alaska, 20, 87, 212
American Federation of Labor, 56 ff., 61, 98, 187; boycott of Japanese goods by, 57; Communists and, 143, 224
American Federationist, 56
American Labor Party, 144, 145, 146
American League Against War and Fascism, *see* American League for Peace and Democracy
American League for Peace and Democracy, Communists and, 142, 223; Congress of, 33; trade unions connected with, 56
American Mercury, 33, 34, 80, 81
American Protective Association, 198
American reaction, demagogy of, 23, 100, 199, 227; incitations to assassination of President Roosevelt by, 39, 121, 130, 231; isolationism and, 76, 98; newspapers and, 125 ff.; red-baiting of, 142 ff.; turn toward fascism of, 44, 52, 186; *see* Wall Street
American Revolution, 117, 230
American Student Union, 223
American traditions and peace policy, 23, 88, 91, 216
American Youth Congress, 223
Ames, Fisher, 114
Amter, Israel, 176
Andre, Major, 113
Anglophobia, 91
Anti-Communist Alliance, *see* Rome-Berlin-Tokyo Alliance
Anti-New Deal Party, 144, 145, 152, 200
Anti-Semitism, 191, 193
Appeasement, 80, 85, 91, 102, 103, 139, 158, 159, 161, 163 ff., 164, 165, 167, 172 ff., 180, 182, 190, 192, 196, 201, 202, 210, 229, 231; *see* Non-intervention
Armaments, *see* Communist Party, position on armaments of
Arnold, Benedict, 112, 113
Austria, 39, 52, 84, 102, 104, 110, 132, 139, 165
Auto Workers Union, officials of, 32, 60, 61

Baldwin, Stanley, 47
Barcelona, bombardment of, 30, 66, 103, 106, 134
Beard, Charles A., 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 89
Benes, Eduard, 140, 181, 182
Berchtesgaden, *see* Appeasement
Bliven, Bruce, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 25, 34, 80
Bloc of Rights and Trotskyites, *see* Trotsky and Bukharin
Blockade, *see* Embargo
Blum, Leon, 71
Bonnet, Georges, 181, 202
Borah, Senator, 124
Bowers, Claude G., 114, 115
Boycott, 57, 58, 59, 95, 169
Brazil, 158
Bridges, Harry, 223
Britain, 19; conspiracy against U. S., 113 ff.; parliament of, 165; Rakovsky and, 126; working class of, 19, 26, 35, 47, 52, 70, 85, 104, 140, 158, 161, 174
Brown, John, 230
Bukharin, N., 60, 63, 101, 110, 112, 114, 121, 122, 124, 125, 152
Bukharin-Brandler group, *see* Bukharin
Burr, Aaron, 112, 114, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 230
Business Week, 241

Cabot, George, 114
Canada, 116, 168, 212

Capitalism, economy of, 234 ff.
Cardenas, President, 39, 85, 155
Carolina Political Union, 39, 62
Carter, Boake, 98
Catholics, 132, 191, 198, 201, 217; hierarchy, 98; Pope, 103
Caucasus, 96, 97
Chamberlain, N., 19, 35, 47, 70 ff., 80, 85, 91, 102 ff., 139, 140, 148, 158 ff., 181 ff., 192, 193, 201, 210, 212, 229
Changkufeng incident, 204
Chile, 158
China, 20, 21, 30, 31, 51, 52, 57, 77 ff., 93, 102, 104, 110, 149, 187, 213
Churchill, Winston, 47, 161
Citrine, Walter, 160
Civil War, 120, 129, 208, 216
Committee to Keep America out of War, 96, 101
Communism, economics of, 234 ff.
Communist, The, 206
Communist International, Manifesto of, 207, 216
Communist Manifesto, 234
Communist Party, 53, 69, 71, 77 ff., 101, 121, 145, 146, 152, 189, 198, 206, 214, 218; and American history, 230; citizenship of, 225; constitution of, 133, 219; and democracy, 43, 131 ff., 175; and elections, 176; of France, 163, 165; influence of, 199 ff., 226; and internationalism, 79, 219 ff.; isolationist attack on, 34, 36, 100; and moral standards, 96; and Naval Appropriation Bill, 62 ff.; opposition to Munich of, 179; and Panay incident, 78; position on armaments of, 206 ff., 209, 228; position on peace of, 17 ff., 40; press and, 133 ff.; and socialism, 185 ff., 200, 225; Norman Thomas' attack on, 123; and United Front, 123; and U. S. Constitution, 62
Concerted Action, policy of, 18 ff., 22, 42, 61, 74, 75, 76; declaration of Labor Legislative Conference of Western Pennsylvania for, 59 ff.; declaration of National Maritime Union for, 58; international conference for, 66, 74; long term policy for, 69 ff.; trade unions and, 55 ff.; unity of peace forces for, 84, 85, 156; United Mine Workers and, 59
Congress of Industrial Organizations, 56, 61, 98; Atlantic city conference of, 58; boycott of Japanese goods by, 58; Communists and, 142, 224; Ohio State convention of, 59
Continental Congress, 114
Copperheads, 230
Coughlin, 33, 51, 71, 98, 101, 146, 191
Czechoslovakia, 39, 52, 93, 103 ff., 140 ff., 149, 154, 158, 165, 173, 180 ff., 201

Daily Worker, 110, 126
Daladier, Eduard, 161, 163, 164, 181, 183, 192, 193, 202, 213
Danzig, 103
Dayton, 114
Declaration of Independence, 219
Democracy, 43 ff., 96, 127 ff., 131 ff., 141, 154 ff., 175, 198, 208
Democracy and the struggle for peace, 28, 29 ff., 37 ff., 45, 96, 98, 150
Democratic Front, 128, 135, 169, 186, 232; Communists and, 145
Dies, Martin, 142, 147, 152, 158, 175, 184 ff., 198, 214, 218, 221, 223, 224
Dimitroff, Georgi, 232
Disarmament, 123
Dodd, William E., 120
Domestic policy and foreign policy, 34 ff., 44, 67, 97, 99, 169, 174 ff.
DuPont, 100

Eastman, Max, 111
Eden, Anthony, 35, 47
Embargo, 21, 88, 89, 93, 106 ff.; against Germany, 149, 160, 188, 194, 196; against Japan, 149, 156 ff., 170, 176, 194, 196; against Spanish Republic, 66, 89, 99, 106, 149, 156, 188, 194, 213; declaration of National Maritime Union for, 58; effectiveness of, 18; Jefferson's advocacy of against aggressor nations, 23, 92; Norman Thomas and, 124; O'Connell Peace Bill and, 59
Engels, Frederick, 234
Ernst, Morris, 221
Ethiopia, 51, 84, 93, 141, 173, 217

Fascism, 106, 154 ff., 183, 202 ff.; American people and, 100; isolationist ideological disarmament before, 26 ff., 38; struggle against, 77, 107; surrender to, 95; Trotsky-Bukharin service to, 122, 131; *see* Amer-

Fascism (*Cont'd*)
ican reaction, Hitler, Mussolini, and Japan
Federalist Party, 114, 115, 116, 118, 119, 128, 230
"Fifth Column," 110
Fish, Hamilton, 101, 224
Force and violence, 129, 131, 132, 133
Ford, Henry, 210
Foreign propaganda, 217 ff.
Foster, William Z., 118, 119
France, 19, 23, 46, 52, 85, 90, 92, 104, 165; Front Populaire of, 85, 141, 155, 158, 183, 213
Franco, General, 46, 89, 103, 110, 165, 213
Frankfurter, Felix, 222, 223, 224
French Confederation of Labor, 71, 155

Gamelin, Gustave, 163
Garner, John, 129, 144, 224, 225
Gates, General Horatio, 114
Gayda, 170
George, Lloyd, 47
Germany, 93, 103, 149, 180, 192, 237
Glass, Carter, 225
Good Neighbor policy, 197, 211
Green, William, 56, 57, 58, 144, 156
Griswold, 114, 118
Guam, 20, 212, 229

Halifax, Viscount, 202
Hamilton, Alexander, 114 ff.
Hamilton, John, 99
"Haves" and "Have-Nots," 51 ff., 83, 93 ff.
Hawaii, 20, 87
Hearst, 33, 51, 58, 71, 98, 101, 111
Hitler, 17, 26, 27, 37, 52, 80, 83, 84, 95, 98, 100, 106, 107, 110, 121, 125, 132, 139, 159, 165, 180 ff., 184, 190
"Holy Alliance," *see* Appeasement
Hoover, Herbert, 98, 99, 144, 174, 179, 205, 225, 229, 239
House Foreign Relations Committee, 70
Hull, Secretary of State, 65 ff., 72, 74, 134, 149
L'Humanite, 163

International Congress Against War and Fascism, 154, 156
International law, 57, 150, 213, 217
Internationalism, trend of organized labor toward, 55, 57, 58, 155; Communist Party and, 79; national interests of U. S. and, 206
Isolationism, 20, 25 ff., 39, 43, 59, 72 ff., 77; acceptance of war of, 82; big naval appropriations and, 63 ff.; cost of, 48; and international anarchy, 94; logical conclusions of, 37 ff.; propaganda of the press for, 34; support of the fascists for, 34; trade unions and, 55 ff., 60 ff.
Isolationist "United Front," 32 ff.; center of, 33; Homer Martin and, 60; left wing of, 32 ff., 50, 51; right wing of, 33, 34, 89 ff.; uniformities of, 35 ff.
Izvestia, 215

Jackson, Andrew, 216, 219, 230
Japan, 20, 21, 50, 51, 52, 57, 58, 59, 63, 77 ff., 84, 94, 102, 110, 121, 123, 140, 201, 213, 237
Jefferson, Thomas, 195, 219, 230; and democracy, 128, 130; and peace, 23, 24, 91 ff., 216; and traitors, 112 ff.
Jews, 132, 198
Jouhaux, Leon, 155

Kellogg-Briand Pact, 40, 67, 88, 92, 95, 150, 159
Kirov, S., 120
Know-Nothingism, 198
Ku Klux Klan, 198

Labor Legislative Conference of Western Pennsylvania, 59
Labor Party, British, 19, 47, 71, 90, 91, 213
Labor and Socialist International, 71, 72, 111, 125, 183
Labor's Councils of Action, 161
La Fayette, General, 113
La Follette, Senator, 62, 63, 99
Landon, Alfred, 125, 225
Latin America, 155, 166, 168, 170, 174, 182, 184, 188, 194, 196, 197, 202, 205, 211 ff., 228
League of Nations, 74, 124, 173, 217
Lee, Charles, 114
Lenin, V. I., 96, 111, 121, 122, 179, 188, 222 ff.
Letter to American Workers, 230
Lewis, John L., 154 ff., 176
Liberty League, 100
Libby, Frederick, 71, 82 ff.

Lima Conference, 197, 211 ff.
Lincoln, Abraham, 120, 130, 191, 195, 216, 219, 230
Lindbergh, Charles, 184, 204
Lithuania, 103
Litvinov, M., 66, 67, 74, 85, 134, 154
Louisiana Purchase, 115
Lovestoneites, 32, 60, 63, 96, 121, 122, 124, 127, 131, 187
Ludlow Amendment, 45, 78
Lyons, Eugene, 111

McClure Syndicate, 121
McNaboe, Senator, 132
Madison, James, 23, 116
Maginot Line, 163
Manchuria, 51, 84, 93, 217
Martin, Homer, 60, 61
Marx, Karl, 111, 192, 234; Inaugural Address to the First International of, 96 ff.
Marxism, 77, 231
Matthews, J. B., 220
Maverick, Maury, 44, 45, 62 ff.
Meaning of the Soviet Trials, 118
Medical Bureau and North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy, 166
Mediterranean, 103
Memel, 103
Mexican Confederation of Labor, 155
Mexico, 39, 85, 90, 158
Midwest Daily Record, 126
Mikado, 17, 37
Military sanctions, 78
Minnesota Farmer-Labor Party, 61
Molotov, 112
Mooney, Tom, 222 ff.
Moral standards, 94 ff., 105 ff.
Morgan, J. P., 210
Morris, Gouverneur, 22, 92, 114 ff.
Moscow trials, 110 ff., 121, 125, 135; American press and, 125 ff.; and democracy, 127 ff.
Mulgrave, 117
Munich betrayal, 179 ff., 203, 206, *see* Appeasement
Murphy, Governor, 176
Mussolini, 17, 37, 52, 84, 95, 103, 107, 110, 173 ff.

Nation, 32, 50
National Council for Prevention of War, 82, 107
National Maritime Union, 58
National Socialist Party, 100
Nazi Bund, 142
Naval Appropriation Bill, 45 ff., 62 ff., 67, 68, 206
Nazi Pogroms, 190 ff., 194, 196, 201, 217
Nazi trade practices, 159, 170
Negrin, Juan, 71
Negro people, 141, 191, 198
Neutrality, 51, 65, 82, 85, 89, 90, 94 ff., 103, 105, 174
Neutrality Act, 40, 70, 74, 106, 228, 229
New Deal, 99, 100, 141 ff., 198, 199, 221, 246
New Deal Party, 144 ff., 200
New Leader, 123
New Masses, 80
New Republic, advocacy of isolation of, 17, 19, 25, 69, 80, 81, 89
New York *Herald Tribune,* 111, 121
New York *Post,* 32
New York Senate Judiciary Committee, 132
New York *Sun,* 121
New York Times, 62
Nine-Power Pact, 40
Non-Intervention, 31, 45
Nyon Conference, 46

O'Connell Peace Bill, 59, 74, 89, 90, 92, 98, 99
O'Connor, J. J., 146
Olson, Governor, 176

Pacific Islands, 87
Pacifism, 36, 94, 207, 208, 228
Paine, Tom, 130, 219
Pan-American Democratic Conference, 168
Panama Canal, 39, 212
Panay, 50, 77, 78
Parallel Action, 70, 72, 91, 103, 205
Peace, position of C. P. on, 17 ff.; *see* U.S. and U.S.S.R.
Peace Action, 102, 103
Peace Coalition, British, 213
Pena, Ramon Gonzales, 155
People's World, 126
Peri, Gabriel, 163, 165
Peru, 197
Philippines, 20, 87, 212
Plebescite, 139, 140
Poland, 96, 97, 103
Protestants, 191, 217

Quakers, 94
Quebec, 39

Radical Socialists, French; Right wing of, 71
Radek, K., 125
Ramette, Arthur, 163
Red Army, 184
Republican Party, 99, 199, 229
Republican-Democratic Party, 114
Rhineland, 84
Revolution, Russian, 238
Revolutionary Army, plot inside of, 114
Rockefeller, 210
Rome-Berlin-Tokyo Alliance, 18, 26, 53, 59, 81, 83, 99, 125, 140, 142, 156, 167, 175, 179, 182, 196, 198, 201, 205 ff., 211 ff., 217, 226, 227, 231, 249
Romm, 125, 126
Roosevelt, Eleanor, 143
Roosevelt, President, 17, 19, 20, 22, 24 ff., 34, 35, 40, 41, 59, 60, 61, 65 ff., 72, 74, 75, 77, 79, 83, 88, 92, 98, 100, 120, 121, 125, 130, 141, 147, 148, 167, 174, 196, 210, 215, 218, 229; Constitution Day Speech of, 44; Jackson Day Speech of, 231
Russo-Turkish War, 96

Sanctions, 107
Schuschnigg, 132, 139
Secession, 115, 117, 118, 119
Second International, *see* Labor and Socialist International
Silver Shirts, 142
Social and national security, 201 ff.
Social-Democracy, 122
Socialism, 49, 53, 79, 96, 108, 135, 151, 185, 219, 225, 232 ff., 240, 247
Socialist Party, 32, 69, 71, 72, 187, 231, 232; of France, 164
Southern Conference for Human Welfare, 198, 224
Soviet Union, achievements of, 188; collectivization of agriculture and, 128 ff.; fascist conspiracy to overthrow, 110, 122, 124; isolationists' conception of, 36 ff., 108; peace policy of, 19, 20, 21, 23, 28, 42, 46, 48, 49, 66, 85, 90, 104, 108, 134, 150 ff., 175, 183 ff., 187, 193; 21st anniversary of, 179 ff., 189; "weakness" of, 184; *see* Communism, economics of; Moscow Trials
Spain, 21, 22, 31, 41; greetings to Cortes of, 45, 52, 84, 100, 103, 104, 110, 165 ff., 173, 187, 213
Spy-ring in United States, 39, 100, 121
Stakhanov movement, 242
Stalin, 42, 71, 112, 114, 129 ff., 135, 154, 179, 188, 232
Standard Oil, 50, 51
Statistical Year Book of the League of Nations, 235
Stern, David, 33, 41
Stimson, Henry L., 99
Student strike, 99
Sullivan, Mark, 121
Supreme Court, 35, 117, 120, 225

Tariff Act, Section 338, 159
Temple, Shirley, 143, 176
Third Five-Year Plan, 240, 241 ff.
Thomas, Norman, 33, 36, 50, 51, 63, 71, 72, 96, 118, 119, 122, 123, 124, 125, 127, 207, 208, 224
Thorez, Maurice, 163
Tokyo, *see* Japan
Toledano, Vincete Lombardo, 155
Townsend Plan, 199
Trade Unions, and peace, 55 ff.; views of more conservative camp, 57; *see* various unions
Treason, *see* Moscow Trials, United States, Soviet Union
Triple Alliance, *see* Rome-Berlin-Tokyo Alliance
Trotsky and Trotskyism, 32, 34, 36, 80, 81, 110 ff., 152, 181, 230
Tukhachevsky, 112, 114

Ukraine, 184
United Labor Federation of Spain, 155
United Mine Workers Union, 58 ff.; boycott of Japanese goods by, 59; and Communism, 59
United States, 48, 49, 52, 60, 64, 65, 77 ff., 82 ff., 93, 101, 161, 169; aid to Spain of 149 ff., 156, 166, 169, 170, 176, 188, 196, 213; anti-Semitism in, 191; Congress of, 64; Constitution of, 62, 128; economic resources of, 87; entangling alliances and, 90 ff.; loan to China of, 170, 214; practical foreign policy of, 65 ff., 70; privileged position of, 72, 83, 86 ff., 105, 148, 158; proposed

01 0001 0132 0702

positive peace policy for, 88, 97, 159 ff.; responsibility for leadership of, 72, 86, 87, 95, 104, 105, 108, 167, 192 ff., 194 ff., 197; threat of appeasement to, 182; *see* American traditions and peace policy
United States and the Soviet Union, 21, 41 ff., 151 ff.; collaboration for peace of, 203 ff., 214 ff., 227; common interests of, 20, 168, 183, 220, 226, 249; democracy, 128 ff.; and treason, historical analogy, 113 ff.

Vandenberg, 225
Villard, O. G., 33, 60, 71, 101
Violence, *see* Force and violence

Wage-Hour Bill, 144
Waldman, Louis, 146
Wall Street, 49, 98, 121, 229
War of 1812, 116, 208, 216
War of Independence, 208
Washington, George, 91, 112, 113, 114
Washington Commonwealth Federation, 61
West Point, 113
Whigs, 230
Wilkinson, General James, 117
Wilson, Woodrow, 222
World War, 17, 39, 43, 121, 238
World Youth Congress, 142

Yagoda, 110
"Yankee imperialism," 197, 211

USHMM LIBRARY
01 0001 0132 0702

Earl Browder

THE PEOPLE'S FRONT

The general secretary of the Communist Party of the United States outlines the position of the Party on current events and issues, such as the C.I.O., the Supreme Court, the welfare of the new generation, the struggle for Negro rights, foreign policy, Japan's invasion of China, the building of socialism in the U.S.S.R., the recent Soviet trials. The author also analyzes concretely the basic contemporary questions of democracy versus fascism, war and peace, socialism and the People's Front, the defense of culture, etc.

He also treats some of the phases of our American tradition—the revolutionary background of the Constitution, and the relation of the ideas of Jefferson and Lincoln to present-day problems.

While these subjects are presented in the form of separate papers and reports, radio speeches and other public addresses, together they give a complete picture of the Communist position.

$2.25